USACE 2012

FUTURE CORPORATE AND HQ DESIGN STUDY

APPENDIX E: IDEAL FUTURES—THE HQ USACE STAFF PERSPECTIVES

Introduction

Each staff section in the headquarters was asked to provide their vision of what the ideal future corporate design was for both USACE as a whole and individually for each of their respective staff sections. The following think pieces were provided to the study team for their use in developing the possible structural alternatives.

Corporate Information: Ideal Future Corporate Design

The USACE mission focus in 2012 would be: Environmental consultation and design, Flood Control, Hydropower, Commercial Navigation, Homeland Security Engineering & Design, Disaster Relief, and Construction Research and Development. The military construction, real estate, recreation, and some R&D functions would no longer be a part of USACE in the year 2012.

Environmental Consultation, Design, and Project Management: USACE would be the primary agent for implementing/executing government sponsored environmental projects. We would be recognized as an "Environmental Service Provider", offering consultation, design, and Project Management services. We would have representation/membership in major environmental groups and would habitually co-sponsor annual events and conferences.

Flood Control & Hydropower: USACE would maintain its current flood control mission but would increase its technical expertise and participation in expanding the Nation's use of hydropower as a key energy source. It would become the Nation's primary agent for licensing hydro-power projects and serve as the DeFacto government leader in hydropower design and construction. Today, licensing or re-licensing of a project can involve many government agencies including, the Fish & Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service (NPS), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and of course…Army Corps of Engineers. Tailoring the licensing process to only one agency would translate to potential labor savings and would also provide stakeholder one government door/ point-of-contact.

Commercial Navigation: USACE would continue performing its navigation mission as we know it today to include associated permits/regulatory program.

Homeland Security Engineering & Design: USACE becomes the primary engineering and construction agent for the Homeland Security Agency. USACE personnel would be specialist in all aspects of physical security design and construction.

Disaster Relief: Same mission as today with added homeland security services.

Construction Research and Development: USACE would team with industry on a fee-for-service basis for engineering and construction R&D. It would divest itself from R&D efforts in which other organizations or industry is already invested and strictly focus on E&C.

There will be a reduction in the diversity of skill sets available within USACE 2012 that is limited to the minimum necessary to meet its reduced mission set. All USACE Project Managers would be PMI trained/certified and all personnel will be trained in basic business management to include basic acquisition rules.

Corporate Information: Ideal Future Design

The IT/IM function within USACE will focus on Program Management, requirements gathering/definition, and Quality Control. All IT services will be outsourced to include

hardware & software and managed centrally and RBC/District Information Managers will focus on defining and measuring service levels, divesting themselves of all IT operations (i.e. LAN management, database administration, systems administration, asset management) .

CECI as a Directorate would transform itself into a Project Management shop, responsible for architecting and requirements definition of all business and technical applications for USACE instead of having individual project managers across each of the functional proponents. All IT investments would truly be corporately managed with emphasis on developing applications that fully integrate the data and business rules of our new mission and functions.

Command Planning Group: Ideal Future Corporate Design

As a leading public engineering organization and an integral part of the Army, the Corps is mainstream provider of engineering missions to the Tri-Service community. Its mission portfolio includes: military infrastructure (plus critical infrastructure protection), installation management and planning, real property management, water resources management (plus critical infrastructure protection), emergency operations and readiness (plus support to Department of Homeland Security), environmental services, power generation and restoration, geo-spatial engineering and other specialized engineering efforts (world class engineering laboratories) and administrative services. These missions are aimed to meet the full spectrum of operations: from defense post conflict resolution to war-fighter support with field force engineering.

Vision Statement: 2012

An agile and nimble public engineering organization leveraged by a full spectrum Joint Engineer Force of high quality, dedicated professionals -- soldiers and civilians -- who are actively engaged in providing the Nation with innovative and competitive solutions during peace and war.

Mission

The mission of the Headquarters U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (HQUSACE) in accordance with OM 10-1-1 consists of the following:

Supports the Chief of Engineers (COE), the Command Council, and the HQ Issues Management Board by facilitating strategic thinking and enabling improvements in the Command's strategic performance, institutional learning and strategic innovation; educating the senior leadership about emerging uncertainties and discontinuities in the external environment; sponsoring strategic initiatives that anticipate any plausible eventuality; and integrating strategic management efforts of the HQUSACE Elements, Office of the Chief of Engineers and Field Operating Activities (FOAs). The strategic management professional consisting of planning, implementation and controls/ evaluation staff provide strategic level technical and administrative services in support of managing the executive direction management process by integrating, managing and supporting two key activities: corporate direction and executive management. The executive direction process is aimed to keep USACE in compliance with key Congressional mandates: Public Law 103-62, Government Performance Results Act and Chief Financial Officer's Act; Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996. These activities are managed across organizational lines and assist the Command Council to make key organization-wide decisions with the support of the HQ Issues Management Board with its respective task forces addressing the strategic engineering challenges facing the U.S. Army and the Nation. Provides, assists and facilitates exchange of information among the FOAs on results from the strategic planning efforts.

Serves as the appropriations sponsor for military construction (MCA) and Army Family Housing (AFH). Performs as appropriations and program element director for the Real

Property Maintenance Activities (RPMA), operations and maintenance Army (OMA) account, and DoD Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP). Maintains an overview of the Reserve Components for the Military Construction and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Programs. Maintains an overview of the Reserve Components Military Construction and Operations and Maintenance Programs (O&M). Assist the Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations (DCSOPS) execution of primary Army Staff responsibilities for USACE TOE units. Establishes combat engineering (force structure), base development, topography, Army and Air Force support. Serves as the point of contact to the DA Staff on real estate and RPMA matters. Provides for family housing operations, acquisition and construction to include family, troop, bachelor, and general officer quarters.

Plans and manages USACE resources as they apply to Civil Works, Mobilization, and Readiness missions. Investigates, develops, and maintains the nation's water and related environmental resources; operates projects for navigation, flood control, dredging, major drainage, shore and beach restoration and protection, related hydroelectric power development, water supply, water quality control, fish and wildlife conservation and enhancement, and outdoor recreation; responds to emergency relief activities directed by other federal agencies; and administers laws for the protection and preservation of navigable waters, and emergency flood control and shore protection.

Supervises the design, engineering, and construction mission of USACE worldwide. Plans execution of assigned design and construction programs/projects for the military services, DoD agencies, federal agencies, and foreign governments. Provides review, analysis, and planning for selected high technology engineering and construction contingency activities involving national security. Monitors all engineering associated with planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of USACE CW projects. Establishes architectural and engineering standards, guide specifications, and procedures and policy for CW, foreign assistance, family housing, military construction and other assigned federal programs. Conducts engineering and construction management studies of USACE field offices.

Serves as Principal Advisor on Real Estate matters to the Secretary of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Engineers and Commander, USACE. Develops plans, policies, and programs for real estate activities for the army. Provides DoD real estate service and budget formulation and execution for the recruiting facilities program. Serves as Executive Agent for DoD in providing real estate service for the Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP). Plans and pays standard level user charges to GSA for owned or leased space occupied by Army activities outside the National Capital Region.

Serves as scientific advisor and assistant to the Commander, USACE, for Research and Development. Directs USACE laboratory activities. Supports the ARSTFF by managing technology base programs in environmental sciences and environmental quality. Participates on HQUSACE R&D Review Committee. Plans and budgets for USACE R&D programs and the management of all resources, including military research, development, test and evaluation (RDTE), the Civil Works R&D appropriations, and mission support funding.

Provides legal counsel to the Chief of Engineers and all USACE Elements; supervises the legal services provided by attorneys of USACE, and maintains uniformity in application of legal projects.

Manages and directs the equal employment opportunity and affirmative employment program for the Commander, USACE.

Conducts inquiries and reports on matters affecting mission performance and state of the economy, efficiency, discipline and morale of USACE within guidelines set forth by in AR 20-1. Serves as the proponent for the development of USACE inspection policy.

Provides a USACE-wide human resources program designed to meet organizational goals mission requirements and employee needs. Provides guidance and staff supervision to FOAs for both military and civilian personnel action. Oversees provision of civilian personnel services to OCE/HQUSACE and other activities in the National Capital Area. Serves as proponent for the USACE leadership development and enhancement program.

Acts directly for the Commander, USACE, on all procurement actions and decisions not directed by law and regulation to be performed personally by the Commander as Head of the Contracting Activity (HCA). Ensures that the provisions of the federal acquisition regulation (FAR) and its supplements are uniformly applied to all purchases. Oversees contracting performance to ensure adequacy of organizational structure, staffing and training programs of each contract office. Ensures maximum opportunity for procurement. Competition in accordance with applicable regulations.

Provides the Commander, USACE, and USACE program directors with the resource support and services necessary to accomplish mission requirements. Such support includes programming, budgeting, finance and accounting, manpower management, program analysis and evaluation, analysis of management and organization policy and procedures, implementation of commercial activities programs, organizational effectiveness, and implementation of management improvement programs.

Directs and monitors the development / execution of a comprehensive Public Affairs program to support USACE missions, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) and the Army Staff Public Affairs activities with USACE FOAs. Provides Command information program for civilian and military personnel of USACE; and conducts public affairs audio-visual media program, including exhibits for USACE.

Provides staff coordination and supervision of security, law enforcement, and intelligence functions in all USACE activities worldwide. Establishes policies and procedures for the application of security, law enforcement and intelligence operations throughout USACE. Manages the automation security program, crime prevention program and economic crime (fraud, waste and abuse).

Advises Commander, USACE, on matters pertaining to small disadvantaged businesses, labor surplus areas, women-owned businesses, and other socio-economic business programs within the USACE. Develops policies and procedures to implement socio-economic acquisition programs and related initiatives as set forth in sections 8 and 15 of the Small Business Act, as amended, and other pertinent publications, directives, and executive orders. Provides assistance to Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business

Utilization (SADBU) and DoD SADBU for development of small and disadvantaged business program policy.

Directs and conducts historical research, writing, and publications. Preserves oral historical interviews; prepares and submits annual historical reviews and summaries; administers FOA historical program; and staff support to HQUSACE and FOA; planning development, and operation of USACE historical center and museum; provides military history instruction, and historical studies; and support to U.S. Army Engineer School.

Manages USACE internal review, audit compliance, and contract audit function. Provides auditing and internal control advice to Commander, USACE. Implements provisions of the comptroller general standards for audit of governmental organizations, programs, activities, functions, and supporting regulations uniformly within USACE.

Manages the logistic functions composed of supply, transportation, material maintenance, facilities and space management, and personal property management for USACE. Serves as the point of contact for USACE with GSA and other government agencies for space management of office and warehouse facilities including building alterations, building services, and plant layout. Supervises the accomplishment of career management programs in supply, transportation, and material maintenance.

Directs the Corps of Engineers Information Mission Area (IMA) and information management (IM) programs to include monitoring IMA functions such as visual information, records management, publications, printing, automation, and communications. Develops USACE Information Master Plan (IMP). Serves on the Army Information Management Council and the Army Information management Working Group. Establishes policy and procedures for information planning, data element standardization, data management, management information control, in education, IM technology assessment, information costing, and information inventory control for USACE.

CPG: Ideal Future Design

We support four key aspirations that guide our work (mission and functions):

Serve our clients as their primary advisors and enable them to deliver superiority in performance, discover excellence in learning, and create breakthroughs in strategic innovation.

Deliver the very best of our strategic services in thought leadership to each and every client.

Create an unrivaled environment in which superior talent can grow, thrive and flourish.

Self-governance involves working and partnering in relationships through Army value system.

Making The 2012 Ideal State Happen: Strategic Elements

Impact-driven professional approach

It is crucial that we combine the notions of impact and professional approach, because we could each be impeccable in our approaches yet not necessarily achieve the depth in

impact to which we aspire. We need to make a difference with the clients we serve individually, while collectively serving the Army, DoD and our Nation so as to have a broader impact on the government-at large and society itself.

Being and delivering the best

It is vital that we be underpinned and driven to develop new knowledge and convey that knowledge to every client, every time. In a professional, management consulting group like ours, intellectual capital and being the best in delivering capabilities must be at core of our very being.

Caring meritocracy that is committed to its people

Without a true meritocracy, we will not be able to maintain our quality standards or attract the kind of people we want to attract. But at the same time, it is necessary that there be a very collegial community in which commitment to caring about our people is paramount. Finally, it is imperative that we dedicate our commitment to renewal of people in order that we maintain our long-term competitiveness.

Self-governing through partnership

Being a self-governed consulting practice, it is important that we do what is right for the Army, DoD and the Nation. As you come into work each day with us, you are not only expected to do your assigned task, but you are expected to step forward and do something about the issues and opportunities you care about – whether it is about the Army, DoD or the Nation. The only way we can keep such a large collection of outstanding people is through self-governance. You must feel control of your own destiny and you can make a tremendous difference to the Nation.

Mission

The Command Strategic Management Group is the provider for executive direction process by integrating, managing and supporting key corporate direction and executive management activities for the Commander and Chief of Engineers that addresses strategic engineering challenges facing the U.S. Army and the Nation. This organization is the integration of all strategic activities entailing the Command Planning Group (long term strategy planning, strategy implementation, strategy controls, relationship management and best practices to keep in compliance with Congressional mandate, Public Law 103-62, Government Performance Results Act and Chief Financial Officer's Act; Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996), Command Support Group and Legislative Affairs Group. This group leverages their professional staff experience with senior management participation in the areas of strategic planning, strategy implementation, strategic controls/evaluation, external as well as legislative affairs, and best practices. Its key thrust is to provide management consulting advice to the Commander and Chief as well as to the Command Council with distinctive, lasting and substantial changes in the Corps strategic performance, organizational learning and strategic innovation with shifts in executive cognition. It facilitates and leverages the Command Council and the Issues Management Board on the strategic management process and its related activities.

Functions

To institutionalize strategic thinking and institutional learning throughout USACE top and executive leadership through effective use of Command strategic planning, operations and execution functions.

Provides long term planning, analysis and evaluation as well as management consulting for Command-wide Strategic Planning to create Commanders Vision and facilitate choices for decision-making.

Conducts organizational net assessments with extensive research and analysis for Commander's final decision. Formulates White Papers for the Chief of Engineers on strategic issues for multitude of purposes.

Conducts strategic reviews, performs analysis and makes recommendations on organizational and/or functional studies as designated by the Chief of Engineers.

Formulates and monitors the environment conditions with scenario management system to assess the weak signals and discontinuous shifts externally.

Manages every Chief's transition related to succession management activities.

Conducts content management services for executive corporate conferences (SLC, District Commanders and ENFORCE), key MSC Conferences and senior leadership strategic forums / meetings (Command Council and Issues Management Board).

To coordinate, monitor and evaluate Command strategic performance, institutional learning and strategic innovation by effectively managing strategic controls and monitoring systems as well as monitor and evaluates the best practices in industry, government and academia so that knowledge about new approaches, methods, tools and techniques is transferred across the Corps.

Coordinates, monitors and evaluates implementation of strategies / initiatives and institutionalizes change within HQ throughout MACOM with enabling related activities.

Provides liaison support to the MSC Commanders support and works closely in consulting and facilitative role on a wide variety of corporate problems.

Integrates and monitors Command Measurement Review to maximize organizational performance, shifts in institutional learning and breakthroughs in strategic innovation.

Manages best practices throughout the MACOM and infuses new and best practices from industry, government and academia into the Corps.

To assist and support the management activities and administrative requirements that are pertinent to the USACE Commander and Chief of Engineers as well as the Deputy Commander.

Prepares briefings and administrative support for the Commander and Chief of Engineers as well as the Deputy Commander for attendance at various meetings.

Manages special project activities assigned by the Chief of Engineers and Deputy Commander.

Crafts and shapes the Chief of Engineers' strategic communications message in concert with functional proponents. The briefings and speeches that is prepared for the CG ensures effective management of the corporate image and ensures that communication

messages is well broadcast and in strategic alignment with Army and Department of Defense requirements.

To cultivate strategic relationships and integrate legislative affairs that result in crafting opportunities by leveraging capabilities to serve US interests domestically and abroad.

Develops, coordinates and facilitates external relationships management activities by creating strategic forums in which USACE Commander and Chief of Engineers can participate in a strategic dialogue between national and international leaders about emerging engineering issues.

Provides the USACE Commander and Chief of Engineers with a consolidated view of significant legislative activities.

Shapes the dialogue on vital issues on national engineering infrastructure by managing a proactive liaison approach to legislative matters through a Command Congressional Strategy.

Civil Works [CW]: Ideal Future Corporate Design

In 2012 the Corps of Engineers will be a smaller organization focusing on serving the Army and the Nation. This service will be directed to our military support for the Nation, and as a federal steward for our Nation's water resources needs. The concept of service will encompass far more than our traditional roles of planning, design and construction management. The predominate proportion (at least 75%) of the planning and design work will be accomplished by innovative acquisition methods including provisions for design-build contracts and potentially as grants. The emphasis will no longer be on us only working as a design and construction agency, but we will be an engineering organization focused on providing valued service to our Nation by assuring that the work gets done.

From a structural perspective, the organization would consist of a smaller headquarters, eight or less divisions acting as regional business centers (RBC), all existing districts would be limited to acting as project management interfaces with the public and project sponsors, and limited research facilities that are uniquely critical to performing our water resources mission. The primary HQUSACE office, located in Washington, DC, would be aligned according to programs, with a Director for Civil Works and a Director for Military Programs. Management responsibilities for these programs would be accomplished within the Washington office, but the responsibility for providing technical guidance for these programs would be transferred to the regional business centers. Approval authorities will be delegated to the lowest possible level, which in most cases would be the regional business centers. The Civil Works Directorate (CWD) would include two divisions, one for Program Management and one for Policy, and a smaller Strategic Directions Office. The Program Management Division would be the primary conduit for developing, defending and providing execution support for the Civil Works program. It would include Regional Business Center support teams. The Policy Division would be responsible for the development of Civil Works policies and technical guidance, and it would include the designated heads of our dam safety, emergency management, environmental regulatory and hydropower programs and national initiatives. In addition the primary HQs office would include the heads of Office of Counsel, PARC, Corporate Information Management, Resource Management, Real Estate, and R&D with reduced staffs, as they would have distributed staff at the RBCs. The total size of HQUSACE (including portions co-located) would be reduced by approximately 15-20%. The RBCs would be assigned HQ functions and those required for managing the workload within their region. The synergy created by co-locating HQ and regional business center functions would be an added value.

Perhaps the greatest change in the USACE 2012 scenario would occur in the manner in which the organization is funded. The staffing of the entire organization will be funded through the GE account. Because the organization is moving towards a regional business concept, the workload within each division will be very dynamic and will have to be managed based on a regional and national perspective. The lines of HQs vs. RBC vs. district human resource assets would appear to be blurred with HQs assets located at RBCs and RBC assets located at many district offices. Centers of expertise will be maintained at their current geographical locations and will be electronically linked

throughout the regional business center to provide effective services to all the projects within that region and thereby maximize the synergy of the regional center. With workload distribution occurring regularly, it will be incumbent on the organization to assure that the limited resources that exist are continuously exercised. The GE account would be justified on a regional basis. Project dollars will be utilized specifically for contract work or potentially as grants. Controls would be developed for those instances where grants are being provided to assure that the federal interests are being protected.

The size of a regional business center would increase with the addition of HQ staff and inclusion of the staff located at the districts and centers of expertise. This increase in size would actually be a redistribution of assets. The overall size of USACE would be significantly smaller.

The Corps at this time will have a core of engineers and scientists capable of planning, designing and constructing the full range of water resources projects to include a wide variety of environmental restoration projects. The Corps will implement a salary structure and an incentive program that will attract and retain senior engineering and scientific experts from the best water resources contracting firms to fill critical vacancies in our planning, design and construction teams. The number of personnel devoted to operation of water resources projects will be declining as these commercial in nature positions are converted to the private sector. Oversight of operations will continue with Corps personnel.

CW Engineering & Construction Ideal Future Design

Premise. Engineering and construction (E&C) functions in the field will be consolidated into several regional centers, built primarily around existing centers of expertise. MSC offices will focus on regional program management. Districts will continue to have sufficient E&C capability to perform their missions, but their technical resources will be managed on a regional basis. Significant E&C support will be performed by architect-engineer (AE) firms or by design-build contractors. In-house E&C support will primarily focus on highly visible projects, and those requiring specialized expertise. Most installation support will be accomplished through long-term open-end contracts negotiated by the Installation Management Agency.

HQUSACE Role. HQ E&C will have a limited role that will support all USACE missions. E&C will be focused externally on providing the technical leadership needed to develop national partnerships and policies that are a key component in satisfying our customers' evolving needs. Internally E&C will be focused on maintaining critical technical capabilities and excellent program performance. The E&C would provide the following technical services

Support for all USACE programs

Update policy, standards and criteria for all USACE programs

Identify necessary specialized expertise, and maintain such expertise at selected centers within USACE

Identify and prioritize R&D needs, and transfer new technology into practice

Interface with other government agencies, professional societies and industry associations in support of all USACE missions

Provide expert consulting services for special investigations and initiatives

HQUSACE Organization. E&C support to HQ and interface with other agencies, societies and associations are functions that will primarily occur in the National Capitol region. E&C staffing will consist of 60 to 80 positions. About 30-40% of the staff (the most senior members who are outstanding technical consultants and managers) will continue to be located in the GAO Building because their work will be focused on external issues and initiatives. The other 60-70% of the staff will be relocated (and perhaps restructured with the ERDC and IWR) because their work will be primarily focused on providing services to satisfy internal USACE requirements. Continuing improvements in virtual workplace technologies will be a key factor in selecting an off site location.

CW Operations: Ideal Future Design

Who owns the current CW Operations functions of Navigation, Hydropower, Flood Control, Regulatory, Natural Resources Management and Recreation in the federal Government? Are the current CW missions in the Army? Probably not (a mistake for the Army because the Army gets more from USACE than USACE gets from the Army on any measure you can name). If however, CW is not in the Army, What business functions went where?

Typical scenarios have Navigation (Locks & Dams, Dredging & R&D for these functions in the Transportation Department (Coast Guard is in HLS). Hydropower goes to most likely Energy [What happens to Bonneville Power or other Regional Power Orgs?] or Interior (BuREC). If it goes to Interior, BuREC has water missions across the entire US rather than just in the West.

Recreation & Environmental Stewardship of our 12 million Federal Acres probably would go to Interior (National Park Service) over Agriculture (Forest Service).

Regulatory goes to ??? – No one wants this dirty job, Not EPA, Not Interior, Not Agriculture (Forest Service).

Flood Control & Dam Safety – don't know where they would go – to FEMA or Federal Emergency element of HLS, not likely. Would probably be forgotten in the dissolution of CW Functions.

What federal agency will referee competing demands for the limited water in a river system? Someone should, if not, there will be real problems.

What would been accomplished by these shifts of mission? NOTHING. I assert that it would be a big Federal mistake to try and separate existing USACE CW missions/functions to other Agencies/Departments because of the interconnectedness of the functions – on rivers or Watersheds. The Federal Government has to get serious about the Water problem in America. Clean Fresh Water is getting scarcer not more abundant and the cost for drinking water will only increase. Recent drought conditions across the US are only a precursor of future events and watershed basin planning & coordination will become more important. Therefore, I postulate that CW stays intact or is a Bureau in some other Non-Defense Cabinet Department.

I believe that there will be some sort of Civil Works element in the government. It can survive without military leadership (commanders) and will probably be military free in 2012. The Army (per Secretary White's Third Wave Initiative) wants to focus on purely military warfighting skills – combat, troop leading, etc. All else is to be purchased from commercially available skill pools. ASIDE - This is an argument based on preference for management of a smaller span of functions than currently exists. It has nothing to do with whether or a function is government-in-nature or not.

I believe there is a very viable and existing mission for a CW element to operate and maintain the facilities that are currently on our 'property books,' and to improve the functionality of existing structures/projects. Certainly the lion's share of CW resources $$ & people) given to CW are associated with managing (operating, regulating, coordinating with others, etc.) than are involved in planning for future projects. However

our organizational culture has placed a premium on acquiring new projects at the expense of existing projects. [O&M is in Phase 2 of P2 – are we not letting the tail wag the dog?] The contracting out issue notwithstanding, some federal element has to manage, operate and balance trade-offs for multipurpose uses of water (our existing missions) – transportation, recreation, drinking (water supply for home, city & industrial uses), flood control, power generation, environmental, regulatory, etc. This is a complex endeavor requiring skill sets not usually accorded to the Operations Division or to the operators and managers of the existing projects. If we do not ever build a new dam or lock, we would have a significant challenge to manage what we are currently responsible for within existing resources and rules, regulations, etc.

The size of the HQ element to do this effectively is probably larger than the size of the current CW element in HQ. Regional offices will probably be larger than current ones if they truly manage all resources for the districts in their geographic area. District offices will be smaller across the board because we will not be trying to have 5-7 independent Engineering, Planning & other elements, etc. within a MSC. There will be only 1 powerful Engineering & 1 powerful Planning element in a Region (possibly not all MSC's will have Planning or Engineering elements – or those that do will be Nationwide centers of expertise, i.e., all Hydropower design would be done in one location, all Lock design in one center, etc.). Area and project offices (whether government or contractor staffed) will probably be the size they are now. Unless we do something REVOLUTIONATRY different, why would we expect to have less manpower than is now expended after years of cuts and neglect on the physical structures and Lakes? If recreation ever becomes a federal priority, we would use manage more manpower, not less.

No matter how you carve and slice spaces and functions between HQ, MSC, District (Area, Project) offices, there will need to be a HQ presence in Washington, DC for representation of missions being performed by subordinate elements of a federal agency. Some element in Washington, DC will have to interface with the Congress, the OMB, and other Federal Agencies. The remaining HQ element, in spite of communication improvements, etc. will have to be able to represent the broad spectrum of Agency functions in a coordinated fashion. [If we subdivide all current 'operational' HQ functions to MSC's, I believe there will still have to be a HQ element capable of representing the totality of these functions. As you add housekeeping (mail, clerical, etc.) the HQ element is usually much larger than any revolutionary new organizational concept envisions.] How much smaller have the Congressional staffs gotten as we "shrink' the size of the Federal government and increase the functions being returned to the states? I think the same analogy applies to our USACE HQ-MSC-Field structure. The HQ USACE is not out of balance with other Federal entities. I believe a comparison of the size of USACE HQ (even if we include HECSA in the numbers) with other agencies would show that we have a small proportion of assets/spaces in HQ compared to field elements. I believe BuRec tried to reduce its HQ size in DC and did not have much success with the effort. The toughest nut to crack is defining what the CW mission is and what control the remaining Agency/Organization has over performing that mission. We have not been successful in attempting to be the Federal Engineer, to broaden our mission(s). Why do we keep on trying?

How does the HQ organization of an agency charged with the mission of operating & maintaining Federal water projects look? What functions are there in HQ vs. in Regional or District or Area or project offices? The CW mission could be done with fewer MSCs (I don't know how many, but retention of General Officer Slots and command positions is no longer a consideration since we would no longer be a military organization.) Most other studies try to resolve this problem while retaining a Military Construction mission. Try to solve it without the MILCON Mission. Suddenly we don't have to keep 2 sets of books, have 2 different funding cycles, 2 major customer groups, 2 geographic boundaries, etc.) Did we/(you) look at Civil Only Districts vs. Civil & Military Districts to learn structural/organizational differences or lessons? I believe there are lessons to be learned from this type of analysis.

Given that I've now created a scenario with a CW only mission, and made comments about MSC & district structure, how does the HQ element of the Operations of existing Federal water resources element look? I postulate 3 elements – somewhat mirroring current structure - Navigation and Operations, Regulatory, and Recreation/Natural Resources Stewardship. I might even make 4 elements rather than 3 to manage & acquire resources for all these existing 'missions'.

The Navigation and Operations element is responsible for coordinating the national programming and technical policy issues associated with operating and maintaining the US Federal Navigable Waterways (Deep & Shallow Draft Harbors, High and Low use commercial navigation channels) in CONUS and all US Territories. This responsibility includes awarding multi-year Dredging Contracts to commercial dredging companies and oversight of any remaining Corps owned dredging assets. The branch also provides central coordination for the Hydropower Function. Hydropower is still managed by multiple federal agencies (TVA, BuRec and USACE) as the federal government has never been able to centralize the Operation and Maintenance of Water Resources -- the stumbling block will always be the Congressional Committees, which have never been able to resolve jurisdictional disputes. I would also like to be able to control funds for R&D efforts to be able to make system improvements.

The Regulatory Element must coordinate with other Federal Agencies and have a consistent Federal policy for Section 10 and Section 404 permit actions. If this element is to be the Federal policeman for protection of wetlands and for assuring that any structures built in Federal Waters will not impede navigation, it must have sufficient resources to examine differences between Regions (MSC's) and to develop and maintain appropriate guidance (to include training of personnel in subordinate elements). I might move resources from the existing Shoreline management permits into a somewhat larger Regulatory element to have all "Permits" in one place and even put Environmental Stewardship expertise in this element.

The Recreation/Natural Resources Stewardship element is charged with all of its existing responsibilities, but will be resourced to be able to consummate effective partnership agreements with Associations and Businesses performing recreational activities on Federal Lands/Waters. Once the Federal recreation mission is defined, this element may grow or shrink in size. While I would try to assign some relatively routine tasks to subordinate MSC's, I don't see any major personnel savings from doing so. The Environmental Stewardship of existing federal properties will continue to require

extensive effort up and down our organization as well as interaction with other Federal elements (Fish & wildlife, EPA, etc.).

CW Program Management: Ideal Future Design

What is the ideal future of your function in serving the success of that USACE of 2012? Do not amplify what exists today and call that the future of your function. Again, it must be technologically feasible, and operationally implementable. Please take up to two pages to give us your vision.

Basic Premise. HQs sets strategic direction, policy, and guidance; obtains necessary resources; provides a national level of program management; and provides the necessary support to the Regional Business Centers to assure successful execution. The recognized technical expertise of the organization is distributed and located in the Regional Business Centers.

The Programs Management Division mission has always been defined in terms of the development, defense and execution oversight of the CW program. In the future, this mission would be modified to include the development and sustainment of the CW vision and would be recast into four basic mission areas; CW Strategic Directions, CW Program Development, CW Regional Business Center (RBC) Support, and CW Program Performance. Or in other words, setting the direction of the program, obtaining the necessary resources, supporting the execution, and measuring performance for the purpose of improving the organization.

Given that the HQs is a much leaner and distributed organization in 2012, the Program Management Division of CW will be a distributed matrix organization with liaison cells in each of the RBC. These cells would function in a matrix fashion within the RBC and serve as an extension of CW-B at the RBC, while providing synergy with the RBC. Although the overall size of the HQs will be reduced significantly in 2012, the CW Program Management Division would have a slight increase in staff as we combine a number of "programs" and focus on the complete CW Program.

Program Management Division would in essence be composed of a number of teams, each of which would operate in a matrix fashion with the necessary elements that provide policy and guidance to the many facets of the CW program. This matrix approach assures the organization of maximum corporate agility with minimum of resources. It also places a great deal of burden on managers/supervisors to assure that the staff that functions within the matrix organization is experienced, adaptive, and that the understand the common goals of the organization. For it will be incumbent upon each of the individuals that function within such an organization to balance their priorities and efforts in order to keep their "eye on the prize".

The CW Strategic Directions Team – This is a matrix team of a select group of the CW Directorate's leadership located in the HQs. The lead and supporting staff of this team would be in CW-B. The responsibility of this team would be the development of the CW vision and its sustainability. They would be heavily involved in the CW authorization and appropriation strategies, the CW communication strategy and implementation, and the President's Management agendas. The leader of this team would have significant interface with congressional committee staff members. This team would utilize the CW-B staff located in the RBC's in getting input into the strategic concepts and in carrying out the strategic vision and communication.

CW Program Development Team – This a relatively small staff of people dedicated to the policy, guidance and mechanics of putting together the CW portion of the President's Annual Budget as well as the preparation for the defense of the budget before Congressional Committees. This team relies heavily on the matrix efforts of the entire HQs, especially the RBC Support Teams and the CW Directorate. This team has significant interface with ASA(CW) as well as OMB. The leader of this team will also have significant interface with the committee staff of those committees that have jurisdiction over Corps activities.

RBC Support Teams – These teams are co-located matrix teams who's function is the support of the RBC's and their execution of their CW program. These matrix teams are comprised of nearly every functional element of the CW program. They are an essential element of the vertical team delivering projects to the Nation and our customers.

The CW Program Performance Team – This team is responsible for measuring and monitoring the overall health of the CW Program execution. It is not an action arm of the Directorate in that it would not be called upon to solve problems, but to identify them as early as possible. The CW Program, and this HQs, current suffer from over measuring. We all know that whatever gets measured in this organization, gets done. The real questions are, Are we measuring the right things? Does what we measure influence and impact other performance measurements? What performance measurements should we have to allow us to move from a reactive to a proactive organization? We have too many indicators that may not be indicative of our program performance.

CW Planning And Policy Review: Ideal Future Design

It has become clear that many of the past streamlining initiatives have adversely affected USACE planning capability and, along with other factors, have reduced USACE capability to carry out proper project planning. At the same time MSC and HQUSACE planning capability and policy review capability also have been reduced. As a result of a number of incidents underscoring the need to restore these planning resources, HQUSACE has established a Planning Excellence Program (PEP) initiative (See Enclosure). The PEP initiative may be expected to influence the future shape and direction of planning, and of planning and policy review. Most important among these are Creating an Office of Water Policy Review, MSC QA/QC responsibilities, Delegation of Approval Authority, Centers of Specialized Planning Expertise, and Planning Model Improvement.

Headquarters

Headquarters will continue to provide planning and policy review for all pre-authorization reports, as well as a few select post-authorization reports. Pre-authorization report review can be expected to remain a HQUSACE responsibility given the views of OMB, ASA(CW), Congressional Committees, and external critics. Headquarters responsibility with regard to PCAs with model agreements will shift from review and certification to training, development and update of model agreements, and assistance to the field.

Headquarters capability has declined over several years through various efforts to shift staffing and priorities. However, it is currently recognized that planning and policy review capability must be enhanced both organizationally and through increasing staffing resources. CW has under review the creation of an office of water policy to be located in CWP. That office is likely to contain 20-30 professional staff, representatives of real estate, counsel, engineering & construction and operations, with involvement of IWR as necessary. This would effectively double the current staff capability. Future required skills will continue to include plan formulation, economics, environmental analysis and social impact analysis. In addition, CWP has been approved to hire a GS-15 chief economist and a GS-15 chief environmental planner, and their responsibilities would include support to the office of water policy review.

Major Subordinate Commands

Major Subordinate Commands will require enhanced planning and policy responsibilities under any future scenario. For example, as MSC's fully embrace their role as regional business centers, they must also fully embrace their responsibility for report and project quality. At present, this is a glaring weakness, and reports frequently mov from districts to HQUSACE without meaningful input from MSC's. In the near future, MSC's will be delegated responsibility for approval for most post-authorization decision documents as well as PCA's with model agreements. This delegation will underscore planning resource needs, and specifically planning and policy review capability. The separate action for MSC's to prepare regional plans for concentrating planning expertise over time may also affect how planning capability is organized at MSC's.

In order to carry out both current responsibilities as well as the delegated responsibilities described herein, MSC's would require about ten professional staff whose skills would include plan formulation, economics, environmental analysis and social impact analysis. In addition MSC planning leadership should include a senior GS-14 economist, GS-14 environmental planner, and GS-14 chief plan formulator.

If MSC's decide to establish regional centers of specialized planning expertise at the MSC headquarters rather than in a district, those professional staff would be in addition to the ten or so professional staff described above.

CW Planning Excellence Program

Strengthen Planning Capability and Leadership

Planner Training & Development. MSC's will prepare *Planner Training and Development Plans*, to include core curriculum, New Planning Associates Program, and the Masters in Water Resources Planning and Management. Plans will be submitted to HQUSACE and updated annually.

Planning Leadership Development (Includes Senior Expert Positions). MSC's will prepare *Planning Leadership Development Plans* to include (a) establishment of GS-14 division plan formulator, economist and environmental planner positions, and GS-13 planning technical specialist positions in selected districts; and (b) specific actions to develop MSC and district future planning leaders. Plans will be submitted to HQUSACE and updated annually.

Centers of Specialized Planning Expertise. MSC's will prepare regional plans for concentrating over time the advance planning expertise needed for the 21st century. Plans should include (a) planning communities of practice as a first step; (b) communities of specialized planning expertise as a second step; with (c) regional (physical) centers of expertise as the final step, and a natural evolution reflecting concentration of workload and associated expertise in a few locations. Plans will be submitted to HQUSACE for certification.

Modernize Planning Processes and Tools

Quality Assurance/Quality Control. MSC's will prepare *Quality Assurance Plans (QA)* that include district *Quality Control Plans (QC)* and submit to HQUSACE for certification. QA Plans must assure delivery of quality reports and projects. District QQ Plans must (1) involve the technical chiefs and their organizations in review and approval of decision documents; (2) involve the planning chiefs and planning organizations in the development, review and approval of planning documents; and (3) have Independent Technical Reviews (ITR) conducted by specialists and/or organizations outside the districts.

Delegation of Approval Authority. HQUSACE will prepare guidance providing for delegation of approval authority to MSC Commanders for all post-authorization decision documents that are in accordance with policy, and Project Cooperation Agreements that follow an approved model agreement. MSC Commanders will prioritize staff resources and capability to assure policy and legal compliance, while HQUSACE will refocus its resources and capability to provide upfront and continuous advice, support, training, and guidance to MSC's and districts.

Planning Model Improvement. IWR will carry out a process to review, improve and validate analytical tools and models for USACE civil works business functions in coordination with HQ, MSC's, ERDC and other Federal agencies, in order to improve their quality and consistency in supporting USACE plan formulation and evaluation.

Environmental Benefit Evaluation Procedures. IWR will carry out a continuing program to improve environmental benefit evaluation; with a focus on completing development of

a protocol for assisting USACE planners in carrying out environmental plan formulation and evaluation.

Environmentally Sustainable Project Formulation. HQUSACE will complete the development of specific policies and procedures to implement the Chief's environmental operating principles by assisting field planners in formulating environmentally sustainable civil works projects.

Strengthen National Water Policy Review

Office of Water Policy Review. HQUSACE will strengthen its national water policy review through creation of an Office of Water Policy Review under the overall direction of the Chief, Planning and Policy Division, Civil Works Directorate.

Equal Employment Opportunity Office: Ideal Future Corporate Design

By the year 2012, USACE EEO program should be functioning in a cost-benefit capacity. The Divisions/Centers/Labs should be combined into 4 regions with district offices intact. The regional operations concept would save USACE an average of 3 million dollars a year through decrease in complaints and overhead costs. The regional concept will include a complaint resolution center; automated data retrieval and complaint processing capabilities. A regional focus would allow for consistency in implementing the EEO process and programs, as well as consistency in training and policy interpretation. CEEO would be serving as a policy and oversight body to the regional EEO operations. The uniqueness of issues in each envisioned region requires that all operating functions be conducted at the regional level and CEEO providing guidance to regions on program policies, practices and processes to includes, but not limited to the following:

CEEO monitoring compliance with EEOC and DA regulations for all regions. Each region would measure compliance in their respective districts.

CEEO ensuring all reports to DA and EEOC are accurate, submitted in a timely manner.

CEEO serving in a advisory manner to CG, on all regional and HQ's issues.

CEEO providing advisory service to regions on all EEO related training.

Each regional EEO would rate the EEO's for the District, with the District Engineer serving as the senior rater.

HECSA: Ideal Future Corporate Design

In 2012, the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity (HECSA) will continue to provide quality, day-to-day operational and administrative support related to resource management, logistics, safety and security, contracting, information management, counsel and EEO. We will provide all of these services to HQUSACE (our primary customer) and varying degrees of support to all other Corps activities in the National Capital Region. Due to force protection requirements prior to 2012 , HQUSACE has relocated to the Humphreys Engineer Center (HEC) to occupy a newly constructed building. Due to the cost effectiveness of the installation, all other office space at HEC is in high demand and is fully occupied. To maintain the installation, HECSA is engaged in managing all facilities and grounds on behalf of the Installation Commander who is dual-hatted as the Deputy Commanding General of USACE. As history has proven, we have continued to adjust to both service level demands and to our customer base increasing/decreasing. Simply put, as the Corps' missions, responsibilities and working procedures continue to grow and change over the next decade as a result of either internal or external pressures.... HECSA will regroup and retool as it has so many times in the past.

History Office: Ideal Future Corporate Design

The Corps of Engineers of 2012 will be quite different from the Corps of 2002. Strategic planning today must broadly consider the full-range of possible future scenarios from a global perspective. USACE engineering and planning capabilities will likely be needed in 2012 but numerous pressures and conditions may determine that the Army is not the best suited to provide them. Non-federal engineering capability will increase, the Department of Homeland Security may become more involved in emergency operations, and other agencies may be more keenly interested in the Corps civil missions. USACE will have stiff competition to retain its role as construction agency for the services. Likely missions for USACE 2012 will include planning, construction supervision, and quality assurance to ensure that federal resources are properly used.

From a historical perspective USACE should provide examples of past successes in responding to changing national needs. Organizational flexibility and people have been key factors in those successes. Tele-engineering and research and development are important Corps' strengths with potential application across a broad spectrum of possible scenarios.

To assume that USACE 2012 will have the same number of divisions and districts as today or that alignments will be more or less the same is unrealistic. Regional water issues and the Corps' role in responding to them may, for example, lead to combining existing divisions. Workload and other realities may lead to some district closures.

Regardless of the picture of USACE in 2012, the Corps must continue to understand and value its past and apply the lessons learned to decision-making and future planning. The organization will continue to change, and history plays a key role in understanding change.

History Office: Ideal Future Design

The Office of History in Headquarters will have the mission "to collect, document, interpret, and preserve the history and heritage of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers."

The Command Historian will continue to serve as principal advisor to the Commanding General and the Chief of Military History on all matters pertaining to the history and heritage of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In addition CEHO will establish and oversee policy for the USACE Historical Program as part of the U.S. Army Historical Program, as directed by Army regulation.

Given the probable nature of USACE 2012, CEHO must position itself to be flexible and adaptive and be closely linked to the strategic planning process. A key function of CEHO is historical analysis that results in a variety of products, from quick studies to published monographs, providing context and lessons learned in a timely fashion for senior decision makers. The Commander's Planning Group will regularly involve Corps

historians as consultants and as team members in the strategic planning process. The Office of History will be a key player in the USACE Learning Organization, will

participate in developing and executing USACE communications strategies, and will be more closely linked to Corps Visitors Centers.

As business practices change, the Corps' Oral History program will be an increasingly valuable tool to capture and preserve the record of USACE accomplishments. More than ever, oral histories will supplement the electronic and written record and be a major component for transferring knowledge within the learning organization.

The USACE Research Collections managed by the Office of History are critical to fulfilling the historical mission and functions. This collection of documents, images, books, and artifacts must be comprehensively indexed and accessible to CEHO staff, USACE employees, and those outside the command where appropriate. The USACE of 2012 will use new technology and digitized sources of information to quickly provide a variety of interesting and useful products for a wide variety of audiences. In the next decade CEHO will continue to expend manpower and dollars to implement an integrated system to assure the collection meets the needs of USACE 2012 and incorporates the latest technology.

USACE 2012 will have a robust field historical program. USACE 2003 has only one full-time historian (GS-170) in the field. Two other GS-170 historians work part-time on historical program issues. The remaining historical program managers have the responsibility as a collateral duty at the Commander's discretion. As a result the program is severely constrained. An inordinate amount of responsibility falls on CEHO. The history and heritage of the Corps is not adequately preserved, senior decision makers do not have the best historical information available, and communication of the Corps' history and heritage suffers. As the result of a redistribution of field resources, each division in USACE 2012 will have a historian who will assure that USACE history and heritage is "collected, documented, interpreted, and preserved" throughout the command. Regional historians will develop regional historical collections and be effectively tied in to the centralized collections through the Internet.

By 2012, USACE will have completed and appropriately staffed a MACOM museum in the Washington, D.C., area. The museum will serve the command as a major vehicle for educating the general public on the history, heritage, and continuing capabilities of the Corps of Engineers. The museum may be collocated with the National Museum of the U.S. Army

Human Resources: Ideal Future Corporate Design

The ideal USACE HR-future mission will be less operational, less procedural or bureaucratic, and more focused on strategic advisory services to management and teams at all levels. However, HR professionals will continue to develop policies, programs and legislative initiatives that will serve changing mission requirements while remaining in synch with strategic plans. HR advisors will deal with tactical events such as decisions resulting in privatization [any decisions regarding inherently governmental or contractible functions], presidential directives, Congressional requirements, Army or DoD Transformation, realignment of Army or DoD support functions, etc., with a focus beyond the "now."

Although the uncertainties are many, this does not deter us from describing an ideal USACE HR future and the strengths ideal HR advisors will continue to need to accomplish undefined mission(s) and challenges while remaining one of the "notable" HR organizations in the federal government by *Government Executive* Magazine and currently by the Office of Management and Budget on the President's Management Agenda "strategic management of human capital" requirement. The USACE HR strategic advisory mission will continue no matter what changes may occur in the command and control of Civilian Personnel Advisory Centers, or even if the Civilian Personnel Operations Centers themselves are contracted out. These changes to the operating aspects of "personnel" may change, but the underlying and more important advisory, strategic planning, and organizational/individual development missions will remain – and become even more important. [It is anticipated that our current operating military personnel and Senior Executive Service missions will also diminish, whereas HR will need to retain advisory capability in these areas – the total Corps team will continue to include these components, as well as contractors.]

Those HR professionals who have a seat at the "planning table(s)" now show us what HR-future looks like; they understand the affect the organization's mission has on a myriad of HR issues and anticipate how changes in mission will impact not only traditional HR programs and tools, but also anticipate inter-related affects on resources management, labor relations, information technology, legislation, safety, contracting, as well as many other mission areas.

There may be changes in the geographic, if not organizational, location of HR professionals, i.e., certain services may be provided from centers of excellence to the entire Corps. For example, a center of excellence for labor relations need not be physically in the HQ. The emphasis on "regional" delivery of service rather than district or division-based program focus will lead to increased standardization of policies and programs across the Corps (for example, learning and leadership programs).

HR staff will continue to be instrumental in advising management on methods to develop the planning capabilities the Corps will need no matter what the assigned (future) mission(s) are. They will focus on developing broadly experienced employees who work effectively in teams. All Corps employees will need to develop and then maintain skills in the areas of resource management, information technology, oversight and contract administration.

The HR advisory mission with regard to emergency operations, especially with regard to natural disaster response, will continue or grow.

Because Congress directly funds the USACE civil works mission (and it is our belief that civil works will continue as a central piece of the Corps mission), the USACE HR staff will continue to perform roles more appropriate to the "department" level, e.g., advisory roles with regard to the President's Management Agenda. This is not true for any other Army organization.

Future HR professionals will:

Design and implement policies, procedures and programs that allow management to recruit and retain the best and the brightest. This would include: 1) proactive recruitment at colleges, universities, professional organizations, state and local government, and the private sector; 2) ability to make timely job offers and to use a variety of financial and non-financial incentives and flexibilities in the recruitment process; 3) ability to compensate employees in accordance with their contributions within a system which makes only broad position classification distinctions among a small number of pay bands; 4) greater flexibility to deal with substandard performance and misconduct and to reward outstanding performance; and 5) effective and efficient individual, team, leader, and organizational development programs.

Understand that the Human Resources function is not solely limited to looking at/treating people as resources in the classical sense, but as unique individuals who can bring to bear their skills, capabilities, and myriad other contributions for the good of the Corps, as well as for themselves as they are made to feel valued contributors to the organization.

Take the lead in managing USACE Strategic Management of Human Capital initiatives and reporting to the Office of Personnel Management and the Office of Management and Budget. Spearhead legislative proposals that meet USACE mission requirements. Recommend USACE serve as a "laboratory" for testing innovative HR and organizational development initiatives. Advise management regarding future workforce needs, assess gaps, and recommend plan(s) to fill gaps.

Assist all levels of USACE employees develop shared purpose, shared values and shared operating principles, to integrate learning in work, use lessons learned, identify best practices and engage customers.

HR specialists will operate as Human Capital managers, consulting and advising Commanders, managers and supervisors on various strategies, techniques, programs, interventions, and resources to enhance the capabilities of individuals, teams, and USACE as an organization

Inspector General: Ideal Future Corporate Design

Currently, The United States Army Corps of Engineers sees itself as "The world's premier public engineering organization responding to our nation's needs in peace and war". There are undoubtedly many critics and those who would disagree with this self-assessment, but one cannot argue with the time-honored success of this proud organization. The requirements for the Corps, or some organization with the ability to perform corps-like functions will exist far into the 21st century. As the Army is transforming, the Corps must also go through a transformation to remain relevant in the future. The study question asked each participant to "describe your picture of the ideal future of USACE in 2012".

I envision an organization where the current Strategic goals have been accomplished and the organization is very capable of attracting and maintaining a quality workforce. The future organization is leaner, in regards to both people and dollars. The USACE workforce worldwide will have "muddled" through "Third Wave", and many jobs throughout the organization will be outsourced. USACE 2012 will continue to value diversity and maintain it as a mission essential requirement. The idea of sharing "lessons-learned" will no longer be a "new idea", but a concept used to create a culture of learning and empowerment; with the end result being an organization that can benefit immensely from each other's successes and failures. USACE 2012 will no longer give "lip service" to developing leaders at all levels, but will have realized that an investment in its people, especially its leaders, or those aspiring to be leaders is both critical and crucial to the overall success of the organization.

The key component to maintaining the status as "The world's premier Public engineering organization…" is the realization that improvements must be made in the way we do business…that will have been accomplished by 2012. The doctrine and practice of Project Management will be firmly in place, easily understood, and readily accepted by the majority of employees. Emphasis will remain on the idea of one Corps, operating regionally and globally. Additionally, it will reinforce "quality" in every mission undertaken by any element of the organization. The concept of quality in all that we do lend itself to the notion that best business practices, leveraging technologies and responsiveness to our customers needs are SOP.

The nation and the world must continue to understand the importance of USACE and its unique abilities. The practice of formulating and distributing information that adequately and accurately reflect the USACE message will be essential for success in 2012 and beyond.

To achieve the 2012 vision, there are numerous organizational changes that must occur. This paper is attempting to state that if we are proactive up front, and it appears that we are on the right track; and if the current USACE vision is articulated and understood; I see no reason why the description above for USACE 2012 would/could not be reality.

Inspector General: Ideal Future Design

The mission of the Office of the Engineer Inspector General (OEIG) is to inquire into and report upon the discipline, efficiency and economy of the command, provide an

independent quality assessment and to furnish the commander impartial constructive feedback. Army Regulation (AR) 20-1, *Inspector General Activities and Procedures,* defines the core Inspector General (IG) functions as: inspections, investigations, assistance, and teaching and training.

I do not envision any drastic or dramatic changes in the roles and responsibilities of the Engineer Inspector General in the year 2012. The Inspectors General function is governed by strict statutory authority, directives, and regulations. The OEIG will be comprised of mostly civilian employees in 2012; given the current trend and proposed Third Wave initiatives. The IG position require a great deal of discretion in the application of governmental authority and the exercise of value judgments in making decisions for the government; given the criticality of the IG mission, all functions will be performed by Government employees in 2012. The Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs) will have a designated representative in the grade GS-13 or higher serving in an additional duty role as Acting Inspector General (AIG). This Acting Inspectors General will aid the command by working assistance issues only, and all actions will be guided by the Office of the Engineer Inspector General at Headquarters, United States Army Corps of Engineers.

The Inspector General function will not see a substantial change in the year 2012. The concepts outlined above are both technologically feasible, and operationally implementable for the future.

Internal Review: Ideal Future Corporate Design

Assumptions follow: (1) No Districts will close; (2) No Division will close: and (3) HQUSACE will exist. The size and services provided by each of these organizations can change.

USACE in 2012

In 2012 the USACE involvement with Army and Air Force Installations will be reduced. The Army reduction will occur if the Installation Management Agency (IMA) is able to perform as expected by the reorganization decision. Installation contracts (AE and environmental included) will be awarded and administered by the Army's centralized procurement organizations. Should IMA not work as envisioned USACE would have to shore up the installations and the military workload drop will not be as significant as I have forecast. The Air Force, unless constrained by their budget, will continue to slowly grow their in house design and construct program. Therefore, with a reduced military program the number of military funded FTE will reduce accordingly.

The USACE Civil Works program and work for others will grow because of Homeland Security and infrastructure projects. USACE will return to the basic principles that grew the Civil Works Program, projects will be well planned and engineered so that they are within budget and meet the needs of the Nation as expressed by the elected officials. An effective engineer intern program with developmental assignments will be established to fill long-term technical needs, short term needs will be filled by aggressive senior engineer recruiting actions. Technical oversight will be strengthened to eliminate current study, design, and construction deficiencies.

Cost and technical efficiencies will be achieved through improved accountability, regional and national centers of expertise, and a requirement that the technical Civil Works leaders must also be trained as fiscal stewards. Project budget forecasts will be realistic and project managers held accountable for risk and cost management. Under my scenario the number of Civil Works FTE neither increases or decreases. Efficiencies occur because of improved business processes.

Internal Audit (Internal Review): Ideal Future Design.

The need for: Commander command and control (C2); compliance testing; external audit liaison; financial statement opinions; emergency/contingency operations and fraud, waste, and abuse audit actions will continue. However, more "pre-emptive" audit services providing the organization a better understanding of business risks and increased awareness of control strategies will occur. Also, auditors will be active evaluating performance measures that are of command interest due to internal and external influences.

The term "Internal Audit" is being used for 2012 in lieu of "Internal Review" since the audit profession considers "Internal Audit" to be an integral part of business management allowing, under Government Auditing Standards, these auditors greater involvement in the "day to day" business decision process. "Pre-emptive" audit services involves input during the initial decision process and the execution with less "after the –fact" compliance and audits. Gathering knowledge and information about the nature of

business risks that face USACE (HQ, MSC, District, Center, Lab), how these risks can be managed; training team members on control procedures/ techniques, and to what extent they impact the USACE business process and strategic goals is an inherent "Internal Audit" competency. In addition "Internal Auditors" are in a position to share that information throughout USACE to increase our ability to minimize risks.

The current buzz word for this audit service is "Enterprise Risk Management" (ERM) which is predicated upon the understanding that business process, risks, and controls across the organization are interrelated. Identification of the root causes is the foundation of the ERM so that risk management resources can be wisely applied.

In 2012 the Internal Auditors will play a more active role evaluating command performance measures. The purpose will be to provide USACE leadership with a better understanding of the forces that affect a benchmark, recommendations about future measurements of the benchmark and improved organizational execution accountability.

Internal Audit Resources will still have to be positioned at both the Command/Control (C2) and execution organizations to execute the above 2012 plan.

Logistics: Ideal Future Corporate Design

USACE will be the industry and government leader and focal point for civil and military engineering research, design, application, construction. This will involve Joint Military Engineering applications, Federal Engineering applications, and support to engineering issues worldwide. USACE will be the world leader in the following areas:

Military engineering and construction in a joint organization – infrastructure approaches (but not limited to structural solutions) airfields, ports, force projection, force protection, construction, design, world class work environments (whether in buildings or any other structure or work environment – at home or abroad including deployed austere environments, war zones, anti-terrorism/force protection measures, etc.), housing (providing creative insights and influence to housing military members and family), environment (focal point for environmental impacts of all military programs from weapons and munitions, to bases, to training, to war fighting),

Civil engineering and construction – civil structures, buildings, navigation systems, inland waterway and water resources system planning. This will involve total integrated systems planning. For example, comprehensive assessment of how changes in navigation might affect economic, environmental, and social systems with equal consideration given to both structural and non-structural options (e.g., traffic management). This will involve much more comprehensive approach to engineering (e.g., transportation engineering – not just construction engineering).

Environmental engineering and construction through a new definition of stewardship or advocate of nations water resources including the environment on par with waterway infrastructure for true environmental stewardship. This will involve a total systems approach to all studies. As the Nation's environmental engineers, USACE will evaluate environmental improvements not just mitigation of incremental environmental damages. USACE will address environmental impacts with the same comprehensiveness and sophistication used in National Economic Development.

Unbiased honest broker, facilitator, and catalyst for public infrastructure decisions. Scientific inquiry will be a core ethic with no predetermined outcomes; no advocacy of positions – except to present the best engineering input, information, data, expertise needed by decision makers to make informed decisions in the best interest of the Nation's priorities. This will involve a fully open deliberation process, and true search for the "right" answer regardless of whether structural on nonstructural.

Learning organization, USACE will institute a culture that includes and considers all essential stakeholder concerns fostering the inquiring, open mind set to seek out and accept outside independent review of its processes and products. It will embrace and include as valued team members environmental/ecosystem expertise from outside scientists and experts. Through "think tanks", academia, interest groups, and others, USACE will also include on the Total Engineering Team outside expertise from other disciplines including: economics, financial, logistics, information technology, personnel management, legal, acquisition management, others. Any organization that has a scientific, inquiring mind set or represents broad constituencies belongs on the team.

Exceptional Stewardship of resources, using them wisely, practicing conservation, maintaining and operating efficiently. It will ensure public awareness and accountability, practicing conscientious full disclosure while it continuously learns and probes to edge of new ideas and innovation.

Attracting the best and brightest from the world of engineering and engineering support by embracing diversity including the necessity for support elements, functions, technical expertise embracing the vital role they need to play in mission success. There will be no more "engineers" vs. the "support" staff (discarding the "engineer can do it all" mentality and truly embracing teaming approaches and solutions). While engineering will still be the core discipline and focus, USACE will also fully incorporate and integrate support areas of expertise such as: information technology, communications, financial, accounting, personnel, logistics, legal, acquisition. USACE will be known as an organization of innovators, constantly seeking to drive changes into law, policy, regulation, that will improve capabilities.

This will mean that:

PMBP Environment will be fully functional**.** USACE will have implemented PMBP fostering teamwork at all levels focused on project delivery. A major culture change will be in place that breaks down the barriers between functional areas to facilitate communication and enhance closer working relationships. This means that all USACE personnel will be welcome on project delivery teams and will find that their perspectives and technical skills and knowledge are valued and applied in meeting customer requirements and expectations through quality and value based affordable projects delivered on time and within budget.

Civil Works and Military Programs stovepipe organization structure will be greatly deemphasized or possibly even eliminated in favor of strengthened functional and technical support framework.

Strengthened Functional and Technical Expertise. Functional and technical support based organizational frameworks will work to provide knowledge, skills, expertise to PDTs and PgMTs. Other functional areas to include logistics will resemble the Real Estate model which has all military, civil, and R&D support elements collocated for focused technical expertise, policy guidance, integrated life cycle planning and management, etc. This will strengthen the KSAs and technical expertise of team members making PDTs and PgMTs even more effective.

Logistics: Ideal Future Design

I see logistics management as a full partner in enabling mission success, generating economies and efficiencies, supporting sound decision making and good stewardship through a totally integrated logistics support environment across projects, districts, divisions. Integrated logistics support will be a key catalyst for continuous transformation of project management and project management support through application of logistics principles and policies as key enablers of mission success at project, district, division, and corporate levels. Logistics will be viewed as a key enabler in providing management oversight and integration of supply, maintenance,

transportation, facilities engineering, and property management functions. Logistics support principles, policies, procedures will be embedded in and integrated with business processes and automated information systems for seamless logistics support.

USACE will be able to obtain logistics support from integrated and flexible mix of support options including both in-house support as well as support from other DoD organizations (e.g., Defense Logistics Agency, Joint Logistics Command, etc.) and government agency resources, along with commercial sector contract resources. Logistics planning will be a vital function ensuring adequate support during contingency and emergency response operations to include everything from humanitarian assistance to war. Full integration of logistics perspectives into the planning efforts will be a crucial factor in success.

We will be contracting logistics studies to determine how best to integrate logistics support, analytical approaches, and basic logistics functions throughout the Command. This will be a critical transformation enabler for USACE to reduce the cost of doing business while improving project delivery efficiency and effectiveness. The Corps will be operating like a business to provide value-added products and services to its customers taking full advantage of professional consulting services needed to identify critical cost drivers that impede both mission effectiveness and waste precious resources. We will be identifying the cost saving approaches and key opportunities that will provide business value by changing processes, performance measurement, integrating e-commerce, policy guidance, leveraging information technology and use system decision and analysis tools.

This proactive emphasis on advance planning and integration will ensure support relationships and capabilities are in place and constantly reviewed to provide for uninterrupted mission accomplishment, minimize costs, infuse efficiencies. This will involve comprehensive oversight and visibility of all assets and how they support the mission to make effective decision support recommendations involving: planning for both current and future operations; analyzing and evaluating most efficient and effective approaches to employ assets including cross-leveling; identifying and developing asset management strategies and budget forecasts to include most effective mix of maintenance, repair, replacement factors; and developing budget forecasts and strategies to optimize mission performance. Logistics considerations, principles, and expertise will be fully integrated and engineered into development of projects and systems, deployment plans and capabilities, and supportability and sustainment.

Comprehensive manpower requirements analysis will be used to determine resource requirements for performing logistics functions including a thorough review of all logistics functions being performed across the Command in other organizations such as civil works operations and maintenance. Personnel will have the required knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) to adequately oversee the logistics management functions at every level of the Command.

This will enable focused emphasis on logistics planning, programming, execution, and integrated logistics support concepts into life cycle development and management of projects. (This includes such key logistics concepts as engineering and designing into projects logistics considerations for reducing total life cycle costs through standardization, reliability, availability, and maintainability.) And current bifurcation and

duplication of roles and responsibilities between logistics organizations, civil works, projects, etc., will be eliminated generating a streamlined, efficient, and effective support structure focused on mission success.

Major Opportunities through Integrated Logistics Support Concepts. Based on the above, I see several major opportunities for transformation of USACE business processes focused on customer support and mission success.

Integration of Logistics with Business Processes. A major overarching opportunity is complete integration of logistics into the project management business process. Sound logistic principles, methodology, and procedures are key to the success of any corporate entity. The implementation of the USACE Project Management Business Process (PMBP) provides an opportunity to integrate logistics principles into the USACE mission and functions. Clearly defined scope and role definition are needed across all major business areas addressing both logistics organizational issues as well as how logistics support, policies, procedures, regulations, etc., will be provided. Combining and consolidating logistics functions into one organization would provide focused logistics support that would promote and facilitate achieving the economies and efficiencies essential to mission effectiveness. It would also be a vital force in developing and equipping logistics personnel for active, value added team member roles on PDTs and PgMTs at every level.

Fully Integrated and Robust Automated Systems Environment. This will focus on business and financial systems (e.g., P2 and next generation "CEFMS") with business process functionality embedded into those systems that include logistics (supply, maintenance, transportation, equipment management) parameters, and data. Query capability will link project management, financial, and logistics data for key management information products that create business intelligence for decision support. This will provide total asset visibility and capability to anticipate and plan for future requirements while enabling application (and cross-leveling as needed) assets across project and district boundaries using automated flexible reimbursement methods. These tools and concepts will be used to apply budget and forecasting techniques and approaches to predict the future enabling decision makers to anticipate requirements, get ahead of the decision cycle, and influence outcomes. This will in turn generate economies, efficiencies, while assuring mission success.

Corporate Maintenance Management Program, System, and Planning. USACE will finally have a standard corporate maintenance management program and corporate automated maintenance management and planning capability. In addition to current approaches to equipment and facility management (personal property and real property) that focus on identifying what we have and where we have it, there will be total visibility of utilization, condition, maintenance requirements, and costs. And there will be emphasis on performing the analysis needed to forecast equipment, facility, and related resource requirements. This will enable USACE to save millions of dollars while providing clear logistics readiness posture at all levels. Such an approach would also enable facilities master planning and life cycle management applications at project and administrative facilities alike. This is a key concept for achieving cost savings while assuring mission success through careful long range planning, analysis, and forecasting.

Data analysis, information, and decision support. We will have vastly improved ability to apply data analysis across systems, functions, business processes. This will focus on transforming data to management information and knowledge that can be used for effective decision support.

Comprehensive Logistics Support Planning Capability. Above capabilities, approaches, and tools will be used to integrate logistics planning with engineering, design, construction, maintenance requirements forecasted several years into the future and constantly updated.

This will incorporate use of advance planning and simulations for alternative methods and scenarios to applying corporate resources to where and when needed at any and all given sites enabling the planned and most efficient and effective application of people, logistics support (supply, equipment, parts, maintenance capabilities, etc.), financial support, acquisition plans, legal preparation, resolution of real estate issues, etc.

I envision a robust capability to apply state of the art program simulation techniques to use data available through integrated automated information/decision support systems in developing alternative scenarios for optimizing, prioritizing, and applying corporate resources to anticipate, forecast, budget for, present to OMB and Congress, annual work plans over a multi-year period of time.

This will provide a true Corporate Planning Capability based on sound business intelligence derived from integrated automated system technology, engineering expertise, integrated support expertise (financial, legal, logistics, acquisition, real estate, etc.) to gather data, develop trend analysis, develop forecasts for project design, engineering, construction, maintenance.

Adequate resources. The entire logistics management area will be resourced to accomplish its vital mission support role through complete integration of logistics into command business process and mission goals thereby dramatically improving the Command's ability to achieve cost avoidances based on application of sound and cost effective logistics principles.

Logistics Readiness and Planning. Complete recognition of the critical need for logistics planning and operations support of military operations.

This emphasis will be even more critical to developing and supporting USACE logistics (supply support, maintenance, and transportation) planning capability vital for support to military operations under the Field Force Engineering concept.

Operations Plans supporting war fighting requirements must have USACE logistics requirements identified. Logistics support and review of unit equipment readiness must be performed.

USACE personnel (e.g., FEST-A or FEST-M units) must deploy on time with required equipment and supply support and receive required operational support in theater.

Logistics support to civil emergency response and recovery efforts will continue to be vital including organizational support to deployed USACE personnel and direct support to FEMA mobilization centers, management of logistics resources, and distribution of supplies and equipment.

Facilities Engineering and Management. This will be key enabler for facilities lifecycle planning, real property management, space utilization and reduction, leased space management, energy, facility manager career program development, networking with peers in HQDA, GSA and other agencies, and automatic information systems in support our USACE facilities. We will be performing real property planning (to include capital investment strategies), programming and budgeting while enhancing the work environment of all USACE team members. Emphasis will be on a world class work environment for a flexible, multi-location, world class workforce. Facility planning will include approaches to flexible work environments applying telework, video tele-conference capabilities, virtual environment techniques, integration of central office, telework, home office environments through communication technology, long range facility requirements forecasts, flexible (temporary) buildings, etc.

Relationship between HQ and MSC Logistics. Logistics functions assigned to HQ and MSC levels will be mutually supportive. Primary HQ roles include: policy and planning, overall program management, coordination with higher HQ, other MACOMs, and other federal agencies, command-wide career program management and professional development programs, management and development of Logistics automated information systems, and comprehensive integrated logistics support policies and planning. MSC emphasis and leadership is required to ensure adequate focus on and support of districts including: regional coordination and execution of logistics policies, programs, plans; regional business center support; technical advice to MSC commander and staff principles; career program emphasis and professional development across all districts for all district level logistics personnel. This involves on-site presence at the MSC level and full participation in MSC horizontal leadership and management team to ensure integration of logistics principles and concepts in MSC plans and programs. This is also vital to the ensuring that logistics concepts, principles, and analytical approaches are included and integrated in the functioning of the RBC promoting region/MSC-wide efficiencies and economies as well as total life cycle management concepts for equipment and projects.

New Organizational Approaches - Regional Logistics Support Concept. A potential organizational structure change that could improve efficiency and mission effectiveness is based on regionalizing logistics support across the MSC to create a Regional Logistics Support Center.

This would involve assigning total MSC logistics support responsibility and resources (including district level) to the MSC or *Regional* Logistics Chief.

Could be similar to the model piloted by ERDC in consolidating its HQ support elements from the various laboratories into one organization.

ERDC's logistics organization (and personnel) is geographically dispersed among the various laboratory sites.)

Under this concept, Division Commanders in coordination with District Commanders would have the flexibility to assign logistics personnel and resources to where needed most throughout the division and reassign them as needs change.

District Commanders could negotiate for additional support as needed for effective mission support under overall coordination of the MSC Logistics Chief.

Instead of duplicating all logistics functions at each district, districts might be assigned as the lead element or technical center of expertise for a given logistics functional area.

As mission changes occur, logistics resources could be shifted (even temporarily) across the region between locations to provide required focused logistics support.

Another variation of this concept could enable logistics professional support between MSCs across a wider region. For example, in MSCs with hard to fill vacancies such as NAD (New York City), overall Logistics Leadership could come from another district location or even another MSC such as LRD or SAD.

Logistics Career Development. We will be a learning organization constantly seeking to improve logistics support to the Command. This involves redefining the role of logistics in USACE to include organizational framework and alignment at each level.

See attached concept for Logistics Career Program Management. Career logistics professionals will follow career path that will be mix of project, district, commercial (contract), other defense and government agencies as they support the work of the Corps. Broad KSAs will be required across logistics functional specialties, acquisition management, financial management, and integrated project management. Both civil emergency management and planning for response and recovery operations as well as support to military operations and planning will be required. Key KSA requirements: Logistics specialties (supply chain management, maintenance, transportation, vehicle fleet management, facilities management, equipment); automated information systems and decision support analysis; acquisition management; financial management (accountability, budgeting, financial analysis); project management; emergency management; military planning and operations.

We will identify all areas that perform logistics work and establish the linkages to logistics policy guidance. We will be focused on training and development by establishing a central repository of METLs required at every Command level to perform logistics functions. Evaluate KSAs of current workforce, determine gaps between capabilities to perform the METLs vs. existing KSAs. Determine mix of training and professional development required to close the gaps. Develop and implement the training/professional development plan through focused IDPs for every team member that performs or touches a logistics process. Evaluate effectiveness of program in closing the gaps.

We will be executing a centralized strategic succession plan for all logistics personnel. Forecast retirements and seek replacements through logistics career program interns (including use of the student career experience program).

Military Programs [MP]: Ideal Future Corporate Design

USACE is universally recognized as an organization that has achieved a remarkable transformation. It is considerably smaller and dramatically more effective due to efficiencies gained through technology and through streamlining of processes between headquarters and major subordinate commands.

We are far more service-oriented than ever before – much more attuned to the individual needs and expectations of those we support and those we work with. We rely very heavily on the private sector, not only for their traditional support in design and construction but also in the support areas. Employment of civil servants only occurs in those functions that have inherently governmental responsibilities or in cases where there is an economic benefit or increased effectiveness demonstrated in a competitive environment.

Program directors are much more involved in the programming and budget process – competing for and allocating resources. The Director of Military Programs (DMP) leads the development of the USACE submission to the Army POM and manages the allocation of Army funding within the Headquarters and major subordinate commands (MSC). The Director of Civil Works (DCW) continues to be heavily engaged in the development of the President's submission to the Energy and Water Bill and manages allocation of General Expense funds within the Headquarters and MSC's. The Director of Resource Management (DRM) serves as subject matter expert on the programming and budget process and advises the Chief of Engineers and the program directors on resource allocation. The Consolidated Command Guidance is a fully integrated effort prepared under the direction of the program directors.

Headquarters is organized along program and functional support lines and major subordinate commands are organized into geographic regions – civil works oriented on watersheds and military programs oriented on the Army's Installation Management Regions. The Department of Defense (DoD) mandated joint basing and some joint regional installation management as an outcome of BRAC 2005. This adds a complexity to our organization and processes as we clarify service roles and responsibilities. DoD continues to advocate for a single defense facilities agency consolidating USACE, the Navy Facilities Engineering Command, and Air Force elements to more effectively support installations, leverage resources, and achieve consistent levels of service.

USACE is recognized as the Army's Engineer with formal responsibilities to provide engineering plans and services support to installations and the war fighter. An important element of this relationship is formal oversight of the Directorates of Public Works on Army installations. The Military Programs Directorate (MPD) is organized along program lines but incorporates regional- and customer-focused elements. Each division of MPD is a program management division unlike the previous organization in which we had Installation Support, Program Management, Environmental, and Interagency and International Support Divisions. With a continued level of deployments and contingency operations associated with the global war on terrorism USACE is recognized as a key provider of technical assistance through staff augmentation reach-back.

The Installation Support Division and Program Management Division merged into the Installation Support Program Management Division (ISPMD). This eliminated the previous discontinuity in the facility life cycle in which the only formal role we played was MILCON design and construction and limited aspects of installation support. Three branches are responsible for different aspects of facility life cycle: Planning and Programming (P&P), Military Construction (MILCON), and Operations and Maintenance Support (OMS). These branches are further subdivided into teams with specific functional oversight. P&P and OMS Branches track reimbursable work performed at the district level to ensure we are performing it in a consistent way and to share the successful installation support practices. Flat-rate service is the exception rather than the rule with clients having broad choice in the level of support provided.

Environmental Program Management Division, although a key player in the facility life cycle, remains as a separate element because it must integrate with both DMP and DCW. Branches are organized to manage specific programs like Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS), Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP), and Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP), and Installation Restoration Program (IRP).

Interagency and International Program Management Division (IIPMD) develops and manages support for others (SFO) and international assistance. This is a departure from its previous mission in which it developed support to non-traditional clients that was then turned over to others for management. IIPMD continues to be the source of "doctrine" for outreach, relationship building, and regional and national interface. The Division Chief maintains the executive agent process to ensure that there is a network of national and regional contacts established for each of our stakeholders. Designated executive agents have responsibility for development and maintenance of those relationships.

Some functions like environmental support, engineering and construction, and real estate remain consolidated but support multiple programs. Where we must retain crosscutting skills in multiple directorates we ensure that there are communities of practice with channels for sharing expertise that avoiding unnecessary duplication of effort. For example master planning processes are the responsibility of DMP while GIS database management is handled by DCW.

A profound change has occurred that embeds the Project Management Business Process as the instinctive way of doing business. Divisions, branches, and teams are organized on functional lines but every member operates comfortably in a matrixed, teaming environment. There are both horizontal elements within the Headquarters and with clients as well as vertical elements comprised of our higher headquarters and subordinate commands and centers.

We rely heavily on AIS systems using a common database to communicate within and between teams. The database has an active element that notifies managers when program or project metrics are out of tolerance. Our managers no longer passively track information but rather actively analyze and manage information to reverse negative trends revealed by leading indicators. Personal communication continues to be an important element of program management with important interchanges added to the electronic record for access by all team members.

Our MSC's use the Regional Business Center (RBC) as the mechanism to accomplish their missions. We have expanded the RBC concept of consistent processes and levels of service across MSC boundaries so that the entire Corps of Engineers is operating as a business center. Recognizing that we cannot maintain full-service districts, we designated regional and national centers of expertise – which have virtual and distributed aspects. Traditional full-service districts are the exception as division and district staff functions are merged. An outcome of this arrangement is the elimination of a layer of staffing as district and division staffing is combined.

USACE is a true learning organization – taking advantage of all forms of professional development. After Action Reviews (AAR) are incorporated at all levels. At the project level they are be conducted at the completion of each phase of work to capture areas needing improvement as well as those successful practices that should be retained. Results are fed into a corporate system of lessons learned to ensure easy access to the tremendous institutional knowledge resident in the command.

In summary – USACE is leaner, more adaptable, more agile, more effective than ever before in its long and distinguished history.

MP Installation Support Directorate: Ideal Future Design

POSSIBLE FUTURE 1: Function does not exist; first pulled into ACSIM/IMA, then contracted out. No extant Army long-range installation planning capability.

POSSIBLE FUTURE 2: USACE responsible for SRM mission, under OPCON to ACSIM. Long-range planning capability critical to Army.

POSSIBLE FUTURE 3: USACE on ARSTAFF, not as separate MACOM. Current missions, including installation support, conducted via FOA's. (Option similar to Possible Future 2.)

POSSIBLE FUTURE 4: Entire Army engineer function combined with other Services as DOD function.

Under Possible Future 1, mission no longer exists: Vestige of USACE role is to manage contracts performing these.

Under Possible Futures 2, 3, 4:

Transformation of Installation Support has been successful, and USACE elements use PMBP to form teams as needed to quickly solve problems; organization has strong agility to form and reform teams as needed-including contractor and part-time personnel. In fact, there is a blurring of organization as people move in and out of government service; HR rules allow people to gain experience where needed.

Organization operates essentially as traditional emergency management function. Offers total solutions to facilities acquisition, rather than focus on design/construction, e.g., may lease/combine contract with construction/maintenance to obtain best facility for purpose. Army uses Activity Based Costing for accounting and management, so total visibility of cost and services.

Technology transfer has matured to the point that lines are blurred between R&D and operations. New innovations are quickly adapted and implemented, helping agility and adjustment to new systems and war fighting methodologies. Communications are seamless and effective.

MP International & Interagency Services Division Ideal Future Corporate Design

Major missions- Homeland security, engineering support to the Army, planning for water resources, implementation of plans.

1. Self sufficient free agents. People make their own travel arrangements, time and attendance, etc. No need for admin positions within technical divisions.
2. Little need for permanent office space.
3. Program manager forwards located at key federal agencies, the Congress, and the Administration including the Pentagon. Might also need PM forwards at service providers such as architect engineers.
4. All Corps information requested from external sources is furnished from readily available databases. Face to face meetings are the responsibility of the subject matter expert. For individual projects, the project manager has the responsibility.
5. Massive decentralization to the field. It's the only way we can create an organization which is flexible enough to survive.
6. Make the RMB's effective by creating centers of competence in one district per MSC- planning, civil engineering, etc. Item 1 should facilitate further centralization of RMO, contracting, etc. Much IM work can be done remotely, as it is here which should allow the centralization of help desks, initially one per MSC.
7. Corporate information should be readily available to those who need to know, eliminating the need for many conferences.
8. Technology should also eliminate the need for most if not all travel, as telecommunications allows face to face meetings without any physical travel.
9. More liberal use of temporary employees to do technical work.

How do we work toward this vision?

1. Reduce the number of permanent spaces in the Headquarters. Most spaces should be 5 year temporary to avoid the entrenched bureaucrat that is an obstructionist.
2. Place an SES position in the major districts that house centers of expertise and have all Corps programs. SES positions in Districts must have served in the Headquarters. Consideration should be given to placing a General officer in these districts.
3. Immediately seek means to remove onerous Contracting, audit, and human resource requirements.
4. Contract out the hiring of GS 15 and SES positions. This will eliminate grievances and reduce the amount of time we spend on selecting personnel.
5. Teach policy to the field continuously and delegate policy review to districts. Districts cannot review their own work. Centers of expertise can facilitate this.
6. Gradually phase out MSC's. They are too small to be effective.
7. We do not need a world class PAO. We need a world class IM. We need to hire the best industry has to offer and put him or her under contract.

MP Programs Management Division Ideal Future Design

USACE transformed from 2002 to 2012 due to several catalysts that presented tremendous opportunities for evolutionary change. The first catalyst was the administration's emphasis on competitive sourcing and the realities of the competitive environment in which USACE operates. The second catalyst was BRAC 2005 and its emphasis on joint service support and operations. The third catalyst was the requirement for support to military contingency operations and the need for infrastructure reconstruction as a tool for stabilizing nations following the contingency. These three catalysts caused USACE to gain universal recognition for a remarkable transformation and is now the "Agent of Choice" for all DoD (and a large share of other Federal Agencies) engineering and construction services.

The competitive sourcing emphasis drove USACE toward more regional operations, which includes centers for administrative and technical functions and program and resource management. The establishment of regional activities drove USACE to retool its automated information systems to support regional management concepts. This allowed HQUSACE and MSC's to become more efficient and effective by streamlining processes as the Project Management Business Process was implemented. The horizontal and vertical integration of the PMBP led to seamless processes that were focused on customer service balanced with federal stewardship. USACE became a Program/Project Management Organization.

BRAC 2005 emphasis was placed on joint service support and operations. USACE offered a holistic program management and execution service proposal to the Army during the early planning for BRAC 2005. This proposal capitalized on previous BRAC experience and integrated USACE functional capabilities for master planning; project and program development; design; construction; continuous commissioning; environmental remediation and restoration; and real estate management and disposal. The automated tools USACE had developed and used successfully in each of these functional areas were showcased in the proposal. Tools such as P2, Fort Future, AT Planner and the concept of the BRAC Planning Lab (formerly the Battle Lab) were enviable features of the holistic proposal. The proposal was so widely recognized as the ultimate BRAC program management and execution plan that it was adopted throughout OSD as the model and USACE became the predominate BRAC 2005 program manager and execution agent. This ultimately led to designation of USACE as the primary OSD construction agent as part of the push toward joint service support. NAVFAC retained construction agent responsibility in geographic areas where they were the primary service provider. The Program Management Division evolved into the Installation Support Program Management Division (ISPMD) as a response to this initiative and these changes and forged strong partnerships with the Army's Installation Management Agency and AF MAJCOM's.

Almost simultaneously USACE was called upon to respond to a number of military contingency operations and resulting infrastructure reconstruction efforts. These challenges highlighted the fact that USACE was not well organized and lacked the processes to respond to rapidly changing demands and timely reporting requirements at the national level. Individual actions assigned to the MSC's supporting the Combatant Commanders were carried out efficiently using the Field Force Engineering Doctrine,

however actions resulting from a need for nation stabilization often became confused. This necessitated a farther redefinition of roles and responsibilities within Military Programs that moved SFO and International program management from Programs Management Division to the renamed Interagency and International Program Management Division. This allowed ISPMD to concentrate on life cycle program management support to the joint services.

ISPMD oversees programs, establishes policies and manages operations for these functional areas – Master Planning and Project Development, Design and Construction Management, Operations and Maintenance Support and the USACE MACOM Engineer. The programs managed include O&M/SRM funded installation support, contingency support to the Combatant Commander, MILCON for all Services and OSD Agencies in the USACE AOR and continuous commissioning which was adopted by all Services as a result of a pilot program authorized in 2002. ISPMD, in addition to normal program management activities, serves as the liaison between the Service HQs in Washington DC and the MSC's. This liaison activity ensures that Washington level expectations for performance and consistent levels of service are relayed to the MSC/RBC's such that support to Regional IMA's, AF MAJCOM's and other regional customers is consistent throughout each region and USACE. ISPMD also has the responsibility to facilitate sharing of lessons learned between the MSC/RBC's via the USACE knowledge management AIS and to ensure USACE is meeting Washington level customer expectations. ISPMD management and oversight of its functional areas is facilitated by the RBC's and corporate AIS. These AIS are made available to customers at all levels so they have full visibility of our management information. This visibility enhances our credibility with our customers and makes them a true and active member of the PDT. MSC/RBC's are an extension of ISPMD for carrying out the ISPMD duties at the regional level. ISPMD relies on the RBC for management of the regional programs and resources and for ensuring Districts are meeting local, regional and Washington level customer expectations and levels of service.

USACE, DMP and ISMPD has evolved into a learning and sharing organization that operates and manages at the regional level meeting customer defined expectations while providing consistent levels of service within the region and between regions. USACE and customers at all levels are valued and active members of the PDT delivering quality projects and services on time and within budget. As a result of this transformation and continued emphasis on "people" USACE has an energetic, highly competent and engaged workforce that prides itself on responsiveness to all customers at all levels.

Office of Counsel: Ideal Future Corporate Design

The essential purpose and mission of the Corps legal services system will not change dramatically by 2012 from what it is today: providing a full range of legal advisory and representational services in an authoritative, professional, and timely manner which advances the major programs of the Corps of Engineers. Our legal work falls into several specialty areas of practice. The most prominent include: advice on Corps statutory authorities to conduct Civil Works and Military Programs, including legislative drafting and analysis of fiscal law constraints; procurement law and disputes; support to regulatory programs and environmental restoration; handling litigation in court and administrative forums; real estate; and general administrative laws such as EEO, personnel, ethics, Administrative Procedure Act, and FOIA. The specialty areas will in all likelihood remain, but the emphasis may shift. The Corps Civil Works and Military Programs missions are evolving, and our legal services system is flexible enough to change and evolve with the programs.

Two major trends started in the mid-1990's are expected to continue and will impact the types of legal services which must be available. Litigation has increased steadily, rising to an all-time high in 2002 with 800 federal court cases pending against the Corps of Engineers. The majority of the nationally significant cases among the total of 800 relate to water resource management and environmental matters. At the same time, DOJ and other support for litigation from TJAG has decreased. These cases have had significant impact on Corps programs. The suits involving the Missouri River Master Manual, for example, interfere with the Corps efficient management of the River. Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act water quality disputes in the Pacific Northwest impact navigation, power, and dam operation. In order to prevent negative impacts from litigation, particularly to our Civil Works navigation, flood control, and other water resources programs, we must make nationally significant litigation one of the Command's highest priorities.

This litigation trend signals the second main shift in the last ten years, and that is the focus on environmental stewardship and restoration in all of our legal support to Civil Works and Military Programs. This requires a different emphasis within the hiring of new attorneys, something which I have already begun. The Chief's Environmental Operating Principles and Corps implementing guidance must eventually be translated into action at all levels of Corps programs, requiring increased legal assistance.

I also expect legal services to be provided in a more integrated fashion, both horizontally with our client's participation at all levels, and vertically from the field through Headquarters and Army General Counsel where appropriate. More and more, the practice of law within government also requires working with state and local governments, other agencies, and branches of the Federal Government. Legal services have always been provided in the context of teaming with our clients; I expect PMBP to be firmly established within the next few years, and taken as a given by 2012. Most of our legal services knowledge management processes and key IT tools, such as Corps of

Engineers Automated Legal Services (CEALS), have already been adapted to meeting the needs of communicating and working within the team concept of PMBP. Better, more effective knowledge management tools must also be developed to efficiently transmit lessons learned, communications between specialty practice groups – and simply avoid duplication and reinventing the legal wheel that already exists. Effective use of technology is essential to preserve scarce human resources.

The number of laws that government must comply with increases every year. The growth since 1975 has been astronomical. We are already feeling strains on resources. Litigation, which is resource intensive, is also steadily increasing. We must minimize needless disputes by providing sound advice before disputes arise. Preventive law, already a priority of the Command, will be an imperative to avoid needless litigation/disputes, while at the same time efficiently preventing mistakes before they happen by working at all levels with the PDT teams.

Organizational changes, such as those being contemplated during the Stockton study, have limitations. While some economies can be captured from regionalizing or centralizing certain legal services, the sheer volume of work will remain the key driver.

Preventive law, better IT and knowledge management processes, and continued insistence on recruiting, hiring, training, and retaining a world class workforce are far more essential to meeting the demands of 2012.

Office of the Chief Counsel's Perspective on USACE 2012

The Corps of 2012 will still be serving the Nation in times of peace and war. The Corps will fully support global military operations, will be one of the lead agencies supporting Homeland Security and Federal Emergency Management operations, and will be executing the Nation's programs in support of Civil Works and the environment. Its Research & Development program, already a world leader, will be even more robust to meet the demands of the Nation in the wake of 9/11. In the next ten years, the Corps most critical areas of change will be within the Civil Works program.

The present is a pivotal time for the Corps. The Corps will be presented with significant challenges and opportunities to serve the Army and the Nation in the next decade. It is absolutely imperative that we execute these challenges with sound technical expertise, quintessential professionalism and uncompromising integrity. The Corps of 2002 has recognized the unambiguous mandate for change, both from the standpoint of processes and organizational structure. By 2012 the Corps will have fully institutionalized the Program Management Business Process (PMBP), thereby executing missions by Project Delivery Teams (PDT) that magnify the capabilities of each individual team member. Corps attorneys will be deeply embedded into all PDT's lending expertise and skills necessary for successful mission execution and avoidance of unnecessary and time-consuming disputes.

Notwithstanding the advancement of the doctrinal PMBP, the Corps, in my opinion, must in "real-time" commit itself to improving its technical expertise in all areas that support our core missions. Process and organizational changes, to include leveraging technology and more importantly, management of tacit knowledge, capable of seriously reducing costs and unequivocally improving efficiency and effectiveness must be funded and

implemented without hesitation. The results of these initiatives must be identifiable within 3 years and validated by 2012.

Civil Works and Environmental Programs

It is very hard to predict the future of the Corps' Civil Works and environmental programs. There are many variables at play, such as Congressional support for the Corps, Corps reform legislation, and the increasing commitment of the Bush Administration to privatize functions currently performed by the federal government. Any of these initiatives, singularly or collectively, could drastically alter the present day Corps. The Corps must therefore prepare itself for further changes in this area. By developing its own version of reform, such as peer review for major Civil Works projects, the Corps can position itself to lead and shape its own future. The Corps of 2012 must have a markedly different approach to the development, economic analysis, environmental assessment, and implementation of civil works programs. Communication, teamwork and virtual integration with all stakeholders will be the norm rather than the exception.

The evolution of the Corps' mission of maintaining navigation systems will likely continue. We have gone from actually performing the work with federal employees, to contracting out certain aspects of the work, to a future that may envision further privatization or grant authority. Moreover, environmental programs have historically been impacted by the fluid nature of our national priorities. This will clearly continue and likely intensify in this modern day of globalization and redefined international politics.

Strengthen Support to the Army and Military Operations

The Corps will be asked to strengthen its commitment to support and integrate deeper into critical Army and Defense programs. The Corps must be capable of adding value to the most current National Military Strategy. This added value will come in the form of leveraging all available Corps assets (technical skills/capabilities, legal support, procurement tools, and influence in the engineering and construction industry, etc.). Some national challenges are already known. For example, over the next ten years the Corps will have undoubtedly focused on areas critical to our National Security such as Homeland Defense, National Missile Defense and the War on Terrorism, as well as certain classified projects. If and when the Nation goes to war, the Corps will add direct support to resolving the conflict. Corps military and civilians will be standing side-by-side with the "warfighters", providing them crucial engineering expertise allowing them to prevail decisively through Field Force Engineering and providing reach back, real-time capability to the Commander in the field. Corps maintained and operating navigation systems will be used to support mobilization.

Army transformation is yet another challenge. At the installation level, we must find better ways of servicing Commanders in both the Army and the Air Force within the context of the TIM initiative. As long as the Corps is project funded, with all support costs billed to the installation, disparate accounting procedures make it difficult to

compete for work on an equal footing with others in government who don't fully account for all costs in their billing to customers.

Regardless of what happens to the infrastructure of the Corps, the Corps' laboratories and scientific talent will continue to play a vital role in support of military missions and programs, as the products they produce and the services they offer truly allow the military to be more adaptable and flexible adding value to our military capabilities. In addition, as the United States implements The National Security Strategy, there will certainly be a corresponding need for "nation building" assistance in those areas subject to military operations or otherwise deemed critical to our global defense posture. These are areas in which the Corps has traditionally played a key role. Defense officials will continue to look to the Corps to execute these types of missions. Accordingly, we must maintain a solid level of technical expertise that will support all scales of military operations and both national and international contingencies.

Workforce Improvements

In my judgment, one aspect of the future state of the Corps is much easier to predict and visualize. The Corps must, starting today, commit itself to recruiting and retaining a better educated, more dynamic and flexible workforce. I am deeply concerned about the level of expertise the Corps will have in 2012 if aggressive succession planning is not implemented immediately particularly in the most critical disciplines. Pay and retention issues have always been a part of federal civil service. If the Corps is going to be able to carry out its most essential missions, whether in the military or Civil Works area, it must have the corporate intellect to do so. That means we must be able to retain our best talent. We must carefully monitor the full range of legislative initiatives and perhaps consider more novel ways to reach out to the best educational institutions and draw into federal civil service those with the superior knowledge and a profound interest in public service. Only then will the Corps have sufficient intellectual capacity to effectively and properly fulfill its mission responsibilities.

Office of Congressional Affairs: Ideal Future Corporate Design

I believe a primary office which functions as the principal focal point for congressional matters at HQ would (does) serve an optimal role. It is the "go to" office for the Chief but also other senior leaders throughout the Command for congressional matters across the full spectrum. The office cannot be expected to know all of the answers regarding projects that Congress may raise but it can be the starting point for Members' inquiries and issues. It can serve a useful role as a point of entry for those congressional offices that do not deal with the Corps on a regular basis. It should not handle issues directly but rather assure that issues that come to its attention are provided to the appropriate HQ element for handling and action. It can play a critical role in developing, in coordination with all other directorates and separate offices (including MSC's), a strategy for the Chief and senior leaders for effectively engaging Congress in order to build and maintain those most important relationships. It can advise on congressional protocol and serve to gather, analyze, and disseminate important information on legislation affecting the Corps, as well as on congressional agendas, priorities, and actions taken that ultimately will impact our organization. It also can serve as the focal point for the Pentagon on congressional matters involving the Corps. This is especially true regarding the Army's Office of legislative Liaison (OCLL), and the ASA(FM) Budget Liaison Office (SAFM(BUL)).
The current mission of OCA is to serve as the Chief's principal congressional liaison, to develop and execute the Chief's congressional engagement strategy, to assist the Chief and the Command in addressing congressional issues, to improve the understanding Congress has of Corps of Engineers missions, programs, and policies, and to integrate/coordinate congressional activities, information, and communication throughout the Command. I see the OCA of 2012 in a similar role but serving a somewhat broader function - amplifying its efforts in strategic thinking regarding congressional affairs, in analysis of pending legislation, and in building and strengthening external stakeholder relationships.

It would have a Chief and a Deputy Chief whose primary function would be to develop, in concert with the other directorates, a strategy for relationship building that would serve not just the Chief but the entire Command. It would have an Administrative assistant who would be engaged in doing much of the research regarding legislation that has been introduced and is under active consideration by the Congress. This would be legislation that would have some impact - both positive or negative- or Corps programs or projects. As with the present organization, there would be three Congressional Affairs Officers (CAO), each assigned responsibility for handling internal/external congressional affairs matters on a regional basis and for active, daily coordination with directorates and separate offices. The CAO's would have a much larger mission for performing more analysis of legislation and of what issues are of concern to Members...tracking trends and providing assessments of whether the Corps was addressing these Member concerns and if so how and why. This would be invaluable information for all Corps staff who deal with Congress.

The Office of Congressional Affairs might also play a bigger role in working with other external stakeholders. There would be a person assigned to OCA whose function would be to coordinate the Command's outreach to other Federal agencies. As the Corps takes

on more and more work for others, it becomes more important for our collective efforts of outreach to Federal Departments and agencies to be effectively coordinated. As the Chief dialogues with high level Federal officials in other departments, someone needs to provide the proper coordination. OCA could play a most critical role in that and, in coordination with other key HQ elements such as PAO, in developing the right messages. OCA also would effectively have the lead for all follow-up actions as result of HQ interface with other agencies.

The OCA of 2012 might logically house an Indian Desk since the Indian Nation, as an external stakeholder, is such an important player in both MILCON and water resources projects and in Real Estate matters. Finally, OCA needs to play a bigger role in strengthening the Corps relationship with the ARSTAFF. We are developing closer, more effective working relationship with SAFM (BUL) and OCLL each year but more effort is needed. This is a critical role and OCA is the optimal organization to do it.

Public Affairs Office: Ideal Future Corporate Design

USACE is America's Engineer. The Corps provides a mechanism to perform water resources development, ecosystem restoration and engineering support to the Armed Forces. They provide the engineering support to FEMA in times of disaster. The Corps has enthusiastically embraced the Corps Communication Principles adopted in 2001, and Corps employees are continually seeking new ways to communicate and build relationships with the wide variety of partners, customers, and interest groups as well as the American public. The Corps "brand" stands for integrity, professionalism and innovation.

Strategy: The Corps is facilitating the dialogue of the nation about engineering needs in the water resources area and for the armed forces. Working closely with the professional organizations and contractors that design and plan the major infrastructure that keeps the nation strong, the Corps is seen as the essential link, but not the bottleneck.

Shared Values: The Corps represents the inherently governmental values in a manner that is understood and accepted by our cost sharing partners, our customers and the American public. The implementation of the Environmental Operating Principles and Communication Principles throughout the organization has brought the Corps into alignment with the values of many of the American people.

Stakeholder Values: The mechanism that the Corps has adopted to deliver projects on time, under budget and of significant quality is such that the stakeholder values are inherently included. Streamlining the bureaucratic requirements and focusing on work that adds value to the end product have accomplished much of this. The Corps technical review center, working closely with the best engineers and scientists in the country, has a world-class reputation, providing review and improvements in a minimum amount of time. The sponsor or customer has complete confidence that the Corps understands the mission requirements because he or she has met with not only the project manager but also many of the Corps leadership. The sponsor has staff working hand in hand with the Corps and the sponsor is at the table for all critical decisions including contract award. Sponsor staff participates in drafting up reports and is a critical member of the PDT.

Structure: The Corps structure includes a headquarters in Washington, regional and district offices. However, the regional offices consist of a Division Commander and an SES for regional interface and program management and a minimum staff. Each regional office is collated with a district in each region that provides support to that office. . There is a national technical review center that is virtually staffed by the world's experts in the state of the practice and state of the art engineering and science. The technical review center often hosts international conferences and is a partner with the top engineering and design schools in the country. The Corps SES oversee programs at the headquarters level, such as programs, planning, engineering and construction and operations and SES are assigned to major projects such as an SES over the Everglades, an SES over the program in response to the war on terrorism overseas, an SES over the program in the National Capital region, an SES in the Pentagon and an SES over the Homeland Security program of the Corps. The Public Affairs Office has been realigned

into the Corporate Communications and Public Affairs Office, works for the Commanders at each level and is closely integrated with the entire business process.

Systems: The Corps has finally implemented the project management business process, but the project manager is the director and coach of the highly functioning matrixed team that is implementing the study or project. The leadership of the team depends on the stage of the project. Information systems have become such that they do not need feeding all the time and a pool of super admin folks who have an eye for detail does the administrative work. Each PDT has not only the functional areas of planning, engineering and construction, but also a representative from contracting and members of the sponsor/customer staff and the other federal and state agencies that are working on the project. Each program area is also staffed with a number of communication experts that assist the PDTs in developing and implementing communication plans for their projects, coach the members on communication skills and insure that actions and communication (words and visual images) reinforces the commitment to serve the nation.

Skills: The Corps remains a highly technical, engineering and science based organization. However, despite this, the Corps staff has become exceptional communicators. Not only do they seek alignment between their words and actions, but they also have developed the facilitative skills to work with a wide variety of disciplines to develop the best solutions. Creative problem solving for complex issues remains a hallmark of the work done by the Corps and its partners. The Corps is a member of and leads dynamic teams that include representatives from academia, other agencies, non-governmental organizations and the private sector to build solutions that are sometimes outside Corps capability. The Corps enjoys a reputation for having people with the highest technical skill combined with exemplary public service. The best and brightest upcoming professionals in multiple fields all want to work for the Corps and have made USACE a top employer of choice.

Style: The Corps style is much more of an open, listening organization with employees who seek the best solutions from a variety of sources. The leadership is diverse and fosters a creative atmosphere that provides fertile ground for the best solutions. Virtual teaming has been implemented for a number of years and employees are able to work from their homes or centers across the country. The type of work that the Corps is doing is so challenging and interesting and the work environment so motivating that the employees have much more freedom and are trusted more by supervisors to accomplish the tasks in a high quality way, on time and under budget.

Public Affairs: Ideal Future Design

Through enthusiastic implementation of the Communication Principles advanced in 2002, the US Army Corps of Engineers continues to seek new ways to communicate and build relationships with the Administration, Congress, and a wide variety of partners, customers and interest groups as well as the American people. The Corps "brand" stands for integrity, professionalism and innovation. Corporate communication is tightly connected with the Corps' strategy formulation, development and implementation. The Corps views the communication function as a strategic asset. Department of Defense has expanded the scope of Public Affairs Offices to better address corporate communication issues and changed the name of the organization to "Corporate Communication and

Public Affairs." Corporate communication professionals (formerly public affairs) advise on all aspects of the Corps business—not just communication. Communication professionals provide strategic communications advice, coach USACE leadership and staff on communications (especially the say-do link), provide tactical and operational support to the PDTs and/or oversee contractors who do this. These professionals are also continuing to do their bottom line jobs public affairs jobs: Providing information to Americans who are entitled to know how their tax dollars are spent and giving people who will be affected by our projects the opportunity to participate in the decisions that affect them and their communities. Communication professionals are not just in the Corporate Communication and Public Affairs Office, but are often found in program areas or attached to major projects. Corporate Communication professionals are part of the commanders' teams at all levels in the Washington and regional headquarters and the district offices.

Strategy: Excellent two-way, symmetrical communication that aligns actions and deeds and embraces the partner, customer and nation as co-producers has become a hallmark of the Corps of Engineers. Communication is everyone's job—but communicating on highly sensitive issues to the media and command is still the responsibility of the Corporate Communication and Public Affairs Office or those who are designated by the command to speak. Project delivery teams focus on better understanding customer needs and expectations while maintaining their inherently governmental responsibility. Highly skilled and knowledgeable senior communication executives work directly for, have direct access to and active support of Commanders and decision makers. Communication professionals coach project delivery teams and the leadership on communication message points and principles. They also coach individual team members on how to approach difficult communication challenges. Measurements tie the value of communications to the value of the work that the Corps completes.

Shared Values: Corps professionals in all areas have come to realize that communication is key to relationships, and relationships are key to serving the cost-sharing partner, the customer and the American public. Investing in communications is valued as essential to good government service, public decision-making and successful project delivery, and project managers happily fund communication activities and labor. The Corps is constantly checking and learning how it can better communicate expectations and better align its actions and words. The Corps enjoys a high level of organizational trust because employees are kept informed of—and influence—policies and decisions affecting them. Corporate communications target program managers and supervisors who are the vital link between senior leaders and employees. Communication professionals assist leaders and middle managers in maintaining this high level of trust by facilitating open communication at all levels. Communication is key to breaking through the traditional stovepipes to ensure those who need information have access to it, that those who have the information share it, and that decisions have ownership horizontally and vertically through the team process.

Stakeholder Values: The Corps staff is closely aligned with the stakeholder values of providing benefit to the American people in national security, the economy and the environment. To achieve this, the public affairs function provides coaching and assistance on gathering input from the customer and the stakeholders to develop better

solutions to complex problems. Communication professionals work closely with partners, customers, interest groups and the public to exchange information in an effort to devise win-win solutions to problems and issues. Information and ideas are exchanged continuously thru the Internet, face-to-face communication and all available means.

Structure: The Headquarters Public Affairs Office has not expanded greatly in numbers since 2003. Cells of two or three people are now focused in the following areas: (1) Strategic Communications, Planning, Integration and Training; (2) Program Support; (3) Community Relations, (4) Media Relations, (5) Command and Internal Information; and (6) Product Support (includes audiovisual support and contracting). The offices structure allows us to solidify corporate brand image and speak with one voice on national themes and issues. The HQ Corporate Communication and Public Affairs Office (CCPAO) is a resource that ties together the greater communication community of practice of the CCPAO at headquarters, region and district; communication practitioners in program areas; and those who specialize in public involvement, customer relations, technology transfer and the community relations programs of interpretive staff and rangers. HQ USACE develops policy, national themes and messages, corporate communication campaigns, branding materials, and training. The Washington office also manages an aggressive audio-visual program and works with the private sector to provide high quality, timely visual images for use by the field. The HQ Corporate Communication Chief chairs a Communication Council composed of the senior professionals from all communication areas, program areas, strategic planning and regional areas provides for the clear link between the corporate strategy and communications and ensures the long term issues and needs are being addressed. Headquarters also communicates with the Army, DOD and other federal agencies to ensure awareness of USACE activities and issues.

Division Regional Business Centers align the USACE strategic communications plan with business goals and missions throughout the region. Regional Strategic Communication Offices assist HQ in developing and implementing national policy and communication initiatives. They provide ground truth for Washington by analyzing trends and regionalizing national messages. They help identify issues of corporate significance and prioritize the use of national communication resources to benefit regional stakeholders and districts. They insure Washington and Army communication campaigns and initiatives are relevant, effective and understood within their regions. They provide linkage for a coordinated one-voice approach between Washington and district interests on sensitive issues. They train and synchronize the regional team.

District Communication and Public Affairs Offices support the project delivery teams and are strategically as well as tactically focused. They are senior staff advisors. Headquarters delivers national products, often using contractors. Where communication professionals are in other offices, the district CPAO provides an integrating function across the district, a one-stop shop for public and media contacts and internal/command information as well as overseeing the content of the Internet.

Systems: The Headquarters PAO works with the leadership and senior staff to integrate the communications function into the organization's overall mission and demonstrates the relevance of communication to mission performance. The Chief Communication Officer has sufficient budgetary and resource authority to implement overall strategic direction

and messaging. The CCPAO is an active player in the assessment of information technology as effective communication channels (intranets, extranet and Web) and coordinates closely with IM. CCPA Offices across the Corps are tied together with an information system that provides for easy tracking of information requests from the media, partners and the public.

Skills: Corps Communication professionals in 2012 are highly skilled and knowledgeable senior communication professionals with professional public relations credentials, a broad range of communications skills, and training that would make them highly competitive in the private sector or other government agencies. They know the Corps business. They are expert at cross-cultural communication. They are in high demand because they stay at the top of their craft through continual learning and effective career management. Because of their keen ability to anticipate trends and emerging issues and strategize and analyze potential communication risks, they are sought out by the organization's leaders to advise strategic direction. When developing and managing communication programs, they use the best of the project management business process. They are coaches and mentors and are skilled at developing and keeping relationships with partners, stakeholders and interest groups. They constantly share information and look for lessons learned in successful and unsuccessful endeavors within the Corps and the corporate world. Research is a regular practice in designing, managing and evaluating campaigns.

Style: Communication professionals move easily through the organization and on the outside. The ability to maintain one foot in the Corps world and one in the outside world provides valuable insights for the entire Corps. Because the Corporate Communication and Public Affairs Office reports directly to the Commander, the feedback loop to the Commander as well as other program areas, is unfiltered and provides candid feedback about how the Corps is meeting the current needs of the nation, the view of the Corps in the "court of public opinion" and alignment to meet the future needs. E-communication continues to make demands for communication quicker and shorten the decision-making cycle requiring access to the leadership and staff of the organization. The integration of communication into the business of the Corps has made Corps PAOs and invaluable mission asset. They are in the best position through function and training to lead discussions and ask the right questions to check alignment of saying/doing.

Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting: Ideal Future Corporate Design

Some Thoughts on the "Current Apparently Insurmountable USACE Situation" to the "Ideal". My premise is that an organizational network is only needed for three major functions: (1) to efficiently manage and execute the organization's missions, and functions; (2) to design means to control the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (VUCA) nature of the externalities that can serve in either advocacy or destructive roles to the organization's advancement and to design regional strategies for optimal integration and (3) to establish a corporate strategy of values, strategic vision, a drive-to-execute, self-governance, a reward system, a system of advocacy and strategic communication. With this premise in mind, I add my personal thoughts on our strengths and challenges, both internal and external that might provide some insight on how we as senior leaders must forge the courage to focus on adaptive solutions (where there can be significant loss for a higher corporate purpose) rather than technical ones if we as senior leaders are truly committed to making a difference.

Our U. S. Army Corps of Engineers is an organizational network consisting of a Headquarters, 8 Divisions, 41 Districts, 3 Centers, and 7 laboratories centralized under the Engineer Research and Development Center where each one of the integral parts of the network are surrounded by externalities that fluxuate over time being advocates or proponents of the operations that are conducted by the Corps as a corporate body. With regard to my premise above, I see the Districts/Centers and Laboratories effectively executing major organizational network function #1; the Divisions and HQ sharing the execution of major organizational network function #2 from two fronts; and the HQ executing and monitoring the "higher corporate purpose" as is delineated in organizational network major function #3. The Corps must assess holistically, without procrastination and cognitive bias, its present organizational network and the external challenges thereto to create the optimal organizational culture to survive and thrive.

Current Internal Strengths/Benefits. The Regional Span of Control of a worldwide geographically disbursed Macro-organizational network; the concept of "One-Door-To-The-Corps; the move to a Project Management Business Process (PMBP); the diversity of human capital expertise replete at every level of the organizational network; the technological enrichment; the inherent robustness of the engineering, construction, environmental and real property missions; the Congressional stability of District survival mainly because of the disbursed and disjoint Civil Works challenges; and the historic technical capabilities and experience that are not substitutable.

Current Internal Weaknesses/Challenges. Constrained and continued reduction in resources allocations; Senior Leadership lack of objectivity or fortitude to design a strategy for change to execute the innovative concepts of strength as listed in the paragraph above that could serve as force multipliers; the apparent lack of understanding of the term "Corporateness"; lack of cooperativeness in the best interest of the public trust; lack of aggressive knowledge management; the perceived arrogance in customer relations; the lack of a comfortable, honest, customer friendly public-trust-focused communication strategy; legislation of business processes from "LaLa--Land" not from where the "rubber meets the road"; lack of incentives for inter- and intra-team excellence through team rather than individual awards; lack of educational strategies to support

empowerment of the workforce; the lack of professionally trained and certified Project Managers; too much individual cognitive bias that stifles change; refusal to surface discomfort and raise the productive range of equilibrium; and refusal to realize that there needs to be a move to adaptive solutions, not technical changes to get to the "USACE 2012 ideal." Adaptive solutions, however, cause losses and there will be a lot of pain before gain.

Assessment of Internal Strengths/Assets and Weaknesses/Liabilities. Again, adaptive solutions "hurt" – they permeate every level of the organization; but critically and objectively analyzing our strengths, weaknesses and the external forces that can promote or adversely impact our progress will be, in my opinion, the best start. In the Corps of Engineers' organizational, where will it be best to take losses, where will we stop duplications of effort, how can we reduce our cost in doing so, how can we assure the military commander that a commitment to "corporateness" can override individual differentiation in his/her career development and goals? How can the senior leaders and the entire workforce adopt a commitment to serve the Corps of Engineers in a new sense of cooperativeness for the "higher corporate purpose?" What are the new systems that need to be in place to forge a "swift trust" among all the people within the Corps of Engineers? How can we forge a bloodline that causes every member to survive with the highest quality of life as the body as a whole becomes the premier engineering organization for the nation and the world? How can we bring the three major functions of an organizational network, as I see it, to an adaptive solution base, and will the senior leadership be the first to commit to the merits of adaptive change? In my opinion, its unselfish, its tough, but it is possible.

Benefits and Challenges of Externalities. Congressional recognition of the potential of the Corps of Engineers as a solid organic project management organization; the recognized DoD and Army interest in fashioning a creditable role for the Corps in war fighting engagements are two major benefits of external forces; but there are still the challenges of potential competitors: industry, the Navy Engineer Organization, the Air Force's vision to modify its strategy; other agency competitors in the Federal Government, such as GSA, DOE, Department of Interior, etc; and the challenges of some members of Congress and members of society, especially when it does not become easy for them to elevate themselves to the "higher corporate purpose of the well-being of the nation and the world". There are more but this is just a quick and dirty start to move you to my framework of thinking about how it can be possible for us to move to a "USACE 2012 Ideal", all factors considered.

The USACE 2012 "IDEAL" – The Corp's Leadership Challenge of Designing "Interdependency" In Its Current Organizational Network. I do not see anything wrong with the complement of the current organizational network. I do not believe its structure needs to be changed; but there is a hard part and that is the culture that exists within each of the integral parts – that must be revolutionized with adaptive rather than technical changes. The Corps has the concept of the Division as the Business Center that it has not used effectively yet. The Division Commander who owns all of the assets of the Division needs to marshal his District Engineers to a Summit and paint the picture of the "higher corporate purpose" specific to his/her region and then let them fashion means to measure their efficiency; their effectiveness; what they do best; what they need to stop doing; what

they need to depend upon others to do; who their customers are; what are the commonalities among those customers; how each commander's individual attributes and superior qualities can be recognized and rewarded; and how each district can be full service with a different concept of "full service?" I believe the "USACE 2012 Ideal" must be framed with a concept of forging "Interdependence" within the network and within the framework of what I believe are the major functions of a macro or mini organizational network. District commanders can no longer remain autonomous, nor can their entities remain full service. Collaboration must be at the forefront so there must be appendages, vectors from every level of the organization to integrate and leverage the best ideas that positively affect the higher purpose of the corporate whole. The corporate whole must be the beacon that guides all actions. As PARC, when I arrived at the Corps in 1997, I institutionalized the idea of a hubbing and spoking strategy in contracting that first of all provided an education on how others in the same division or corps-wide were effecting the business of basically the same type of contracting in such disparate ways by letting them see scatter diagrams of their own productivity and drawing them to a decision that they must be interdependence among districts; that there must be centers and satellites of excellence rather than everyone at varying levels of the learning curve during everything. Looking at the basic premise, the strengths, the weaknesses, and the potential impacts of externalities, I believe the Regional Commanders need to have a Summit to fashion an interdependence that will propel the organizational structure that we have today into the adaptive solutions that will be needed for the Corp's current organizational network to envision and institutionalize a "USACE 2012.

Recommendation: As much progress is being made with the efforts under the "Stockton Study", I am not convinced that we as senior leaders will be able to get to where we want to go with an internally lead study – we might get there quicker with an independent assessor who is given a performance-based specification on the expected outcome, but who would not be constrained by history or cognitive bias in any fashion. Should you disagree, I raise this to our consciousness as a challenge for all of us to get to the zone of discomfort and raise the range of productive equilibrium so that we get to the same end, led by one of our members.

Research and Development: Ideal Future Corporate Design

Alternative 7 makes no change to the R&D Directorate other than moving its reporting chain. The recommended plan makes substantive changes to align R&D with the principles of USACE 2012, saves ED&M funding at HQUSACE, and eliminates a significant overlap in Alternative 7 between the R&D Directorate and ERDC Center Support Team (CST).

The R&D Directorate and ERDC recommend that R&D be transformed more aggressively than shown in the recommended USACE 2012 alternative in order to better advance the principles of USACE 2012 and save ED&M funding. We recommend that we follow the template of transformation used for the Human Resources, Resource Management, and Corporate Information Directorates by similarly separating R&D advisor/policy and liaison support functions.

Advisor/Policy Function: The R&D advisor-to-the-Chief role and policy function would become part of the HQ's Policy and Corporate Integration element along with Human Resources, Resources Management, Corporate Information, and Counsel. Focus of this function would be on (1) providing science and technology advice to the Chief of Engineers, and (2) policymaking from a MACOM perspective, both internal to the Corps and external with other MACOMS, DA, DoD, national agencies and congressional. Thus, the function provides science and technology advocacy and maintenance of standards within USACE leadership. The function would be staffed from existing CERD personnel, to include the SES Director, SES Deputy Director, GS-15 Executive Director, and probably two or three support personnel, secretary and administrative. The position of Director for Research and Development (regardless of title changes) would be designated as a member of the HQUSACE Principal Staff.

Liaison Support Function: The Liaison Support Function would be moved to the ERDC CST in support of operational activities. The CERD personnel currently performing this function would be reassigned to the ERDC and would be paid for by ERDC funds, thereby freeing up ED&M funding at HQUSACE. Additional staff may be required from the pool of ERDC employees to facilitate appropriate coordination across all major business and technical areas. The CST would liaison ERDC support to Civil Works, Military Programs, the Regional Support Teams, DoD, and other agency customers. The function would be staffed with existing CERD staff reassigned to the ERDC, to include the three GS-15 program managers, GS-13 program analyst, and other support staff not retained in the HQUSACE R&D advisory/policy function. Since these staff members alone may not be adequate to meet the need, ERDC leadership would determine the appropriate on-site/off-site staffing level and mix that would be necessary to meet the CST requirement and then staff the team, accordingly.

The recommended structural realignment enables HQ's R&D to concentrate on policy, advise the Chief, and provide both a national interface and USACE S&T leadership. It moves the liaison of ERDC support to the ERDC CST. ED&M funding is saved by this realignment, and it would eliminate duplication that would occur if the liaison support remained in HQs R&D and the ERDC CST also performed liaison support. We recognize that there are challenges to implementing the DRD/ERDC plan, to include

adequate staffing and manning to support the structures for the HQUSACE R&D advisor/policy group and for the ERDC CST. A clear delineation of "policy" (read: HQUSACE) versus "operational" (read: ERDC) will be necessary to help ensure that the right team is working a particular issue, with well-integrated vertical and horizontal communication to ensure that an issue gets the appropriate treatment from both a policy and operational perspective. In short, all parties have to be working together as part of an integrated whole.

Real Estate: Ideal Future Corporate Design

The Corps should be a major player in addressing and assessing the nation's infrastructure needs.

Should have a role in nationwide water management – who gets the water, what laws apply–the Federal government must manage and resolve theses issues–can't be decided amongst the sates or intrastate only

Expand the role of watershed management–although some folks complain about having to deal with several districts in one area or state. Maybe there should be more focus on watersheds and the regional issues associated with them. Current Civil Works Divisions are based on watersheds in theory but we don't seem to be focusing regionally–still very district–oriented and/or project-oriented. True focus on watersheds and the regional economics, etc. should help promote our internal goal of "regional business centers" that many seem to give lip service to now.

Relook MSC's/Districts for possible consolidation (realizing political sensitivities). Must keep the civil and military missions in the Corps. Ironically, many of the CREST folks who support deployed forces – our real link to the war-fighting Army–are from the civil side of the house. There is a synergy in the two missions--we need to develop and train people on the civil side to support the military.

MSC's act like true extension of HQS … with major goal of setting Districts up for success. Reassess MSC functional components and mission alignment.

Stronger presence in the Pentagon and increased interaction with ACSIM and the Installation Management Regions in carrying out the Chief of Engineers Army Staff missions. Direct funding for USACE military missions.

Program/project management fully integrated as a process–no longer exists as a discipline.

One automated management system–fully integrated with CEFMS.

RE: Ideal Future Design

Assess increasing centers of expertise to achieve economies of scale and enhance customer service.

Capitalize on centers or pockets of expertise for major programs or customers. For example, OMB is asking CW to look at consolidating planning expertise in 3-4 places throughout the country.

Look more seriously at the Savannah model where it services Wilmington and Charleston – capitalize on communities of expertise.

Direct fund Real Estate's military mission, regardless of funding for the rest of USACE, to carryout Congressionally mandated actions, which the commands were unable to budget for. Would also enable us to proactively serve as advisors to installations and commands to maximize capital management of real estate assets.

Military work moved to one full service district in each MSC and liaisons at the major installations.

Down side to consolidation is that land and laws about land are very local and change from state to state. Could lose efficiencies as a result.

Complete efforts to consolidate all Real Estate systems into a single system fully integrated with CEFMS.

HQ needs to focus on national perspectives and interface, policy and programmatic issues

Maintain technical expertise at the HQs; stay involved with issues and projects to best enable us to develop policy, plan strategically and provide oversight of the direction off competitive sourcing.

Need to decide for ourselves--not have others do it–what do we need to own and what can we rent--i.e. what do we need to do ourselves and what can we get form the private sector.

Resource Management: Ideal Future Corporate Design

Mission of USACE Resource Management in 2012. Our Resource Management function exists to provide resources (dollars and manpower) and comprehensive financial management support to USACE Commanders and staffs at all echelons in the execution of assigned missions in support of the Army and the nation. Resource Management includes program and budget formulation, execution and analysis, manpower management, organizational analysis, finance and accounting policy, management and operation, business practices and program evaluation, and career management. This mission is accomplished within the guidance of OMB guidance for preparation, submission, and execution of the budget (OMB Circular A-11) and within the Department of the Army PPBES framework.

Vision for USACE Resource Management in 2012. We will provide world-class Resource Management services as a value-creating partner in USACE mission accomplishment, enhancing the project management business process and supporting our dynamic customers.

Philosophy of Resource Management in 2012. We will provide the Commander at all levels with excellent unbiased resource analysis and advice. We will safeguard our resources and prepare timely and reliable financial records and statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and Chief Financial Officers Act requirements -- with emphasis on continuous learning and improvement. We will monitor and guide the use of resources in accordance with legal and ethical business practices

USACE Resource Management Operating Principles. We will:

- Assure effective financial and manpower planning, execution, analysis and advice. Formulate budgets with programmatic insight that result in justifiable requests for resources to satisfy mission needs. Partner with functional and program managers to ensure limited resources are allocated in priority order.
- Manage resources to accomplish program goals. Maintain systems that both allocate resources to programs and projects within provided funding levels and monitor budget execution, including trend analysis and overall assessments of the financial health of operations.
- Provide accurate and relevant financial and manpower reporting to customers. Provide timely reports in a useful format as specified by higher authority or as designed by individual managers and project sponsors.
- Assure adherence to laws and regulations to promote accountability, financial integrity, and good stewardship of taxpayers' dollars. Ensure responsible use of Corps assets and install systems to guard against fraud, waste, and abuse. Assure compliance with generally accepted accounting principles to produce reliable financial statements in accordance with CFO requirements.

- Improve effective and efficient use of Government resources. Target high impact areas of risk assessment and measurement through command staff inspections, and other performance reviews, and identify and implement commercial best business practices, including systems modernization, reengineering, decentralized controls, application of modern quality principles, and implementation of electronic commerce.

The USACE Business Environment in 2012. The business environment that our Resource Management organization will face in 2012 will be quite different that today's business environment. We will face tight federal budget appropriations with our Agency budget tied to performance indicators and performance measurement. We will be required to continually prove our value to the nation. We will be coping with steady budget dollars to repair our aging water resource infrastructure and repair negative environmental consequences from past development. We will be facing stiff competition from the private sector and other Federal agencies. USACE will be receiving more reimbursable work (dollars) from many different sources that places a heavier burden on our finance and accounting system. USACE will also be doing more work overseas in support of our efforts to improve the infrastructure of many developing countries.

The USACE Business Unit in 2012. The "business unit" of the US Army Corps of Engineers will migrate to the MSC or regional level with the Regional Business Center as the focus of all management decisions involving projects, workload, and distribution of resources. All resources will be disbursed directly from HQUSACE or other sources (in the case of reimbursable work) directly to the MSC (or Laboratory or Center). MSCs will use one standard database. Product Delivery teams will be able to use resources from anywhere. Districts will no longer have the set geographic boundaries that they have today, nor will they have the set military/civil/environmental missions/functions that they have today. Resource Management will provide advice to RBCs as to the most efficient organizational structure.

The Resource Management Organization in 2012. With the "business unit" of USACE migrating to the MSC, the Resource Management organization will change. Regional budgeting, cost analysis, and manpower functions will be done almost entirely at the MSC's, UFC, and at HQ. The District Resource Management functions will be focused on supporting management of the District, management of the operating budget, managerial accounting, and supporting project management and product delivery teams. The District Resource Manager will have a smaller staff to support the District. MSCs will need more capability (especially in manpower). HQUSACE will need fewer Resource Management resources. All levels of Resource Management are likely to have significant contractor presence. The MSC Resource Manager and his office will be more "operational" in nature. The MSC Resource Manager should reside at the MSC headquarters, but some staff could reside at one of the MSC District locations. More work at all levels will be done virtually from distant locations.

The USACE Finance Center in 2012. The USACE Finance Center will be working with a new Project Management and Resource Management system that will replace CEFMS. The new system will utilize a single database that can be rolled up or down as needed. Employees from any District, Laboratory or Center (when allowed) can charge to any project or organization throughout the USACE. The new system will update project status as new status is inputted.

Resource Management Careerists in 2012. Careerists in Resource Management will have the education requirements outlined in the CP11 Accreditation Plan. The series of certification level standards will improve the proficiency and professionalism of the Resource Management careerist. Careerists in Manpower (CP-26) will have the education and experience requirements outlined in the CP26 Career plan.

Small Business Office: Ideal Future Corporate Design

The Small Business Office serves as the Chief of Engineers senior business advisor and program advocate. Assuming USACE maintains its unique contracting mission, the Small Business Program will be continue to be a player and integral part of PMBP. First, it is a statutory requirement, but more than that it is good business to develop businesses, to grow competition for our contracts, and to insure a broad base of capable suppliers to strengthen the industrial base. The jobs created are vital to this nation's economic prosperity. The Small Business Program is mission essential and USACE will remain committed to ensuring that small businesses have the opportunity to participate in our procurements and that we provide the training and counseling to help them succeed. The mission statement and values for the Small Business Program follow:

Small Business Mission Statement

Establish the USACE as the government's premier organization in assisting small businesses. We endeavor to provide procurement opportunities, train and counsel businesses for success, and establish a broad base of capable suppliers to support the Army's mission. We are an innovative and forward-looking organization seeking new and better ways to provide quality support, exercise leadership in small business program management, create clear and relevant guidance, and champion programs and procurements to increase readiness and serve our soldiers and the nation.

Small Business Office values are …

Integrity

- Honest and ethical. Doing the right thing, always.

- Fair and objective decision making and problem solving.

Service

- Committed to counseling and training small businesses in growth and development.

- Providing accurate and responsive information (internally and externally) in a cooperative team building manner.

Advocacy

- Fostering an environment in USACE that promotes opportunities for small businesses to participate in our procurements.

- Developing and implementing the policy, guidance, and command oversight for the USACE Small Business Program.

Security and Intelligence: Ideal Future Corporate Design

The USACE of 2012 will be more engaged around the world than it is today, as difficult as that is to believe. Due to its ever-increasing worldwide commitments, USACE will require a more robust and re-designed intelligence and security structure.

By 2012 the national intelligence structure will have been reorganized due to the War on Terrorism, which will continue into the future. Although bin Ladan and al Qa'ida will have been destroyed by that time, other terrorist cells will fill the void and continue the same fight that has been ongoing since biblical times.

Although national intelligence organizations will provide a certain level of information to USACE, they will have neither the manpower nor the specific interest in providing the intelligence and security needed to provide force protection to USACE personnel and assets.

As a MACOM, USACE will need a Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence (DCSINT), G-2. The Chief, Intelligence and Security Countermeasures, a branch of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, currently perform this function. Although intelligence is a support function to all operations, Army doctrine is such that the intelligence function is a separate and distinct mission area.

Due to both the increasing importance of intelligence and the ever-increasing intelligence requirements for the command, the new DCSINT, G-2 will be an SIES (SES) position. The current arrangement of having intelligence and security personnel working for the respective commander will be altered and command and control of security and intelligence personnel will be centralized at HQ USACE.

Although security personnel will still be required at each level of command, they will also function regionally according to expertise in various security programs. This will allow Commander USACE the flexibility to focus intelligence and security assets at needed locations much in the same way we fight floods, hurricanes, etc. today.

The intelligence and security personnel of 2012 will be flexible because they will have standardized job descriptions and be trained to a standard that will allow any security manager to go anywhere and perform the same function. They will have grades standardized at the appropriate level instead of today's practice of having people doing the same job with grades ranging from GS-7 to GS-13, a truly ridiculous situation.

By 2012, enough USACE assets will have be attacked that commanders will be forced to recognize the absolute necessity of having full time, trained security professionals in place and will give them the necessary resources to accomplish their mission.

By taking the actions noted above, the command will move into the future as safely and securely as is possible and will protect its personnel, property and information.